# THE DOUBLE TEXT OF JEREMIAH

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY J. & C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

# THE DOUBLE TEXT

OF

# JEREMIAH

## (MASSORETIC AND ALEXANDRIAN) COMPARED

TOGETHER WITH AN APPENDIX
ON THE OLD LATIN EVIDENCE


BY

A. W. STREANE, D.D.

FELLOW AND DIVINITY AND HEBREW LECTURER OF
CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE
AND FORMERLY TYRWHITT'S HEBREW SCHOLAR.



CAMBRIDGE
DEIGHTON BELL AND CO.
LONDON GEORGE BELL AND SONS
1896

"Those who believe the study of the Scriptures to be alike their duty and their privilege, will surely grudge no pains when called upon to separate the pure gold of God's word from the dross which has mingled with it through the accretions of so many centuries."

Scrivener, *Introduction to the Criticism of the Text of the New Testament*.

# PREFACE.

MY object in the following pages has been to make some contribution towards an examination of the text in one of the most interesting of the prophetical books. A large part of my aim is indeed accomplished if I have succeeded in marshalling some of the evidence in a way that may assist the labours of other workers in the same field.

I have not sought to discuss, or even enumerate, *exhaustively* the variations between the M.T. and the LXX. I therefore from time to time omit to notice such small variants as the occurrence, unrepresented in the Greek, of מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה, נְאֻם יְהוָֹה, and the like, unless there be some local reason for drawing attention to them, *e.g.* if a passage is characterised by *many* such accretions—a word which, as it will be seen, I consider to represent, speaking generally, their nature. On the other hand accretions in the Greek, as rarer, are carefully noticed.

In chap. xi. and onwards I omit the letters prefixed in the previous chapters to most of the notes, and explained in the Introductory chapter (pp. 13–15, 18–22). I have assumed that the use of these letters in the earlier part of the notes is sufficient to convey information as to the proportions assumed by the different kinds of variation which may be observed in a comparison of the Hebrew and Greek Texts.

In consequence of an interval which unavoidably occurred between the printing off of my notes on the first ten chapters of the prophet and that of the remainder, three recently published critical works came into my hands too late to be consulted in the former part of the book, viz. the Commentaries of Giesebrecht (Gi.)[1] and of Cornill (Cor.)[2] and the annotations on O. T. passages by Perles[3]. As will be seen in consulting my notes on chaps. xi.–lii., I have there made repeated reference to both Giesebrecht and Cornill, often disagreeing with their views. As regards the earlier portion of these

[1] *Das Buch Ieremia übersetzt und erklärt*, von D. Friedrich Giesebrecht, being part of the *Handkommentar zum A. T.* Göttingen, 1894.

[2] *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Critical edition of the Heb. Text arranged in chron. order, with notes*, by C. H. Cornill (Eng. tr. by C. Johnston), in the *Critical Edition of the Sacred Books of the O. T., printed in colours*, ed. Paul Haupt, Leipzig, Baltimore, London, 1895.

[3] See p. 150.

notes (chaps. i.–x.), I would point out two passages, where Giesebrecht appears to have hit upon the right emendation :

(*a*) In vi. 6 הוֹי עִיר הַפֶּרֶק is an ingenious and very possible conjecture. He compares Nah. iii. 1.

(*b*) In viii. 18 read מַה בְּלִיגָתִי = מַבְלִיגָתִי.

In v. 28 Cornill's account (p. 47) of עָבְרוּ (to be "emended to עבין, in accordance with Deut. xxxii. 15") is probably the right one.

In iii. 1 I accept Perles' (p. 48) emendation of לֵאמֹר to לֵךְ אֱמֹר (out of לֹ אמר).

At a time when increased recognition has begun to be accorded to the importance of Versions, it is hoped that the Appendix on the Old Latin evidence to the text of Jeremiah may be of some interest and utility.

In a work containing such multifarious detail, I cannot hope that no errors remain undetected. I have used my best endeavours to secure accuracy, and take this opportunity of expressing my acknowledgment of the great help afforded me from the care and skill displayed by the printers and readers of the University Press.

## CORRIGENDA.

P. 35, l. 24 *for* "all" *read* both.

P. 38, l. 15 *for* בָּעֵת *read* בְּעֵת.

P. 39, l. 13 *for* (iv. 31,) viii. 2, 20, x. 4 *read* (comp. iv. 31, viii. 2, ix. 4,) viii. 20.

The passages within the parenthesis, although not cases of *transposition* for the sake of sound, furnish us with parallel phenomena. See also p. 19.

P. 45, ll. 13, 14 *for* "superavi" *read* Desperavi.

P. 60, l. 12 after "verb" *insert* would give אֶרְפֶּה.

P. 72, l. 19 *dele* "In l....παραλυθήσονται."

P. 77, l. 3 *dele* XII.

P. 85, ll. 23, 24 *dele* "SH. and St Jer....O′."

P. 117, ll. 15, 16 *for* "they seem...(ἀφανισμόν)" *read* It is quite possible that it was absent from their Heb. text.

P. 150, l. 13 *for* "may" *read* might.

P. 150, l. 14 *for* "note" *read* note and App. ad loc.

P. 152, l. 10 *insert* (before מַיִם) מְקוֹר.

# INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

To students of the Old Testament the phenomena presented by the earliest Greek version as compared with the Massoretic text, have always presented features of attraction. It needs but a slight amount of study of the Septuagint to perceive how very various were the qualifications and character as translators[1] of those who had charge of the work. The general closeness of rendering which belongs, for example, to the greater part of the Greek Pentateuch stands in sharp contrast with the amount of blundering and inaccuracy found in Isaiah or in the Minor Prophets.

In the Book of Jeremiah the interest evoked by a comparison of the two texts has long been recognised as of a special type[2], the nearest Biblical approximation to which is supplied by the double text of Tobit or of Judith.

[1] Even in this Book alone inconsistencies of rendering (see e.g. critical notes on ii. 6, *καὶ ἀκάρπῳ*, iii. 13, *κατακυριεύσω*, vi. 23, *ζιβύνην*) point to the employment of more than one translator.

[2] Origen in *Ep. ad Afric.* (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* xi. Paris, 1857, p. 56) and St Jerome in the Prologue to his Comm. on Jer. (Migne, *Patrol.* 24 Paris, 1845, p. 680) refer to the variations.

In the Critical Notes, which form the body of the present work, I have sought to examine the variations between the two texts. Accordingly I have in the first place taken chapters i–x, and aim here (see p. 17) at "a tolerably minute examination" in order to classify as accurately as possible the causes of the variants. In the later chapters on the other hand I have been content with somewhat less minuteness of detail. In them accordingly the letters prefixed (see pp. 17 ff.) to most of the notes in the earlier chapters are omitted. But nowhere have I consciously passed over a deviation of text which presented any feature of interest.

In the Appendix I have arranged, in as succinct a form as seemed attainable, Old Latin authorities (MSS. or patristic quotations). The importance of this branch of evidence is, I think, undoubted. The clearly accidental character e.g. of Codex B's omission of ἐκ μήτρας in i. 5 (see p. 28) is borne out by overwhelming O. L. testimony.

We may conveniently arrange the divergences between the two texts of this prophet under three headings:

1. There is a difference in the position (and in the order of sequence) of the prophecies uttered against foreign nations. In the Hebrew text these stand near the end of the Book, while in the LXX. they follow upon chap. xxv. 13, and are differently arranged among themselves.

2. Besides some passages of considerable length (the longest are chaps. xxix. 16–20, xxxiii. 14–26[1], xxxix. 4–13, lii. 28–30), there are a very large number of shorter expressions which are found in the Hebrew only. It will be convenient in practice to call these *omissions*, provided that the word be not understood to imply anything more than that they are absent from the LXX.'s text.

3. There are an immense number of other divergences between the two texts, viz. additions, transpositions, and substitutions of very various kinds, these last suggesting Hebrew, in some cases more or less resembling, in others quite unlike, the Massoretic Text.

Referring for the first of these three divisions to the discussion in the Critical Notes *in loco*, we proceed to deal with the others, so far as they concern chapters i–x, separately and in minute detail.

### A. "*Omissions.*"

These (in common with other variations) have been ascribed to carelessness on the part of copyists (St Jerome), or to their ignorance (Hitzig, Umbreit), or to haste in their transcription of the LXX.'s Hebrew original (so Dean Payne Smith in *Speaker's*

[1] A Messianic passage. We may note that, as the Apocrypha indicates, the Alexandrian Jews do not seem to have been at all as much influenced as their brethren of Palestine by the hope of a personal Deliverer.

*Comm. Introd. to J.*, Vol. v. pp. 324 f.); or on the other hand to the translators' design, this last view finding numerous defenders (Naegelsbach, Keil, etc.)[1].

The first two hypotheses have few, if any, supporters. Of the third I cannot but feel on a careful examination of the subject, that even were it admissible as an explanation of the "omissions," it would fail to explain the numerous other divergences. But neither is the view which attributes the variations to design on the part of the translators, by any means a satisfactory account of the case. For if we choose any passage of at least eight or ten verses in length, and compare closely the two texts, we shall, I think, be persuaded that the aim of the translators was *on the whole* to give a faithful and close rendering of the Hebrew before them, their literal reproduction of the original often amounting to a fault. Honesty and straightforwardness are stamped upon their work. Their general accuracy, unless when special reasons intervened which induced them to depart from it, although it is not of course to be judged from a nineteenth century standpoint, is in fact such that we become more and more convinced that in the case of that class of variations of which we are now treating, they must in the great majority of cases have been justified by the Hebrew text

[1] For a fuller statement see Prof. G. C. Workman (= Wo. in the Critical Notes), *The Text of Jeremiah*, Edinburgh, 1889, pp. 6—10.

which they had before them. Their evident desire was to solve, not to shirk, difficulties. Those difficulties necessarily confronted them. For Hebrew had ceased to be a living language, and much was only known to them by tradition[1]. Accordingly when under these circumstances there came a rare or difficult word to be dealt with[2], we look with interest for their treatment of it. The two methods, to which, as we can clearly see, they ordinarily had resort, were (*a*) conjecture[3] (sometimes by the help of a cognate language or dialect[4]), and (*b*) transliteration[5]. When a translator deals in the main with difficulties thus, it is impossible to suppose that his reason for omitting whole passages is because it appeared to him that they were difficult or might easily be dispensed with[6].

[1] Passages in these chapters, which seem to throw some light on the amount of grammatical knowledge possessed by the translators are ii. 6, 17 [Gk. 16], 20; vi. 16, 18; vii. 28, 32.

[2] But when the difficulty lay in the *construction*, there is at least one instance in these chapters where they seem to have been not unwilling to cut the knot by omission (iii. 1, לאמר; comp. x. 13).

[3] Probably a certain amount of lucky guess-work is latent in their translation.

[4] e.g. iii. 5.

[5] e.g. viii. 7.

[6] See A. Scholz, *Der Masoretische Text u. die* LXX-*Uebersetzung des Buches J.*, Ratisbon, 1875, pp. 22—25. Elsewhere (p. 105) in that work he adduces in support of the same view an argument, which is less convincing, viz. that, inasmuch as in the time of the LXX. translators Hebrew had ceased to be a living language, acquaintance with the Hebrew law of parallelism must also have died out. If then, he argues, the LXX. had abridged the

Again, we find frequent "omissions" of *simple* Hebrew words, such as must have been well known to the translators. It is hard to suppose that men who at any rate on the whole rendered with such an amount of literal accuracy would have arbitrarily omitted easy and appropriate words or sentences. Hence we are led to the conclusion that these were absent from the text with which they had to deal[1].

But perhaps the strongest argument of all for the superiority of the text represented by the LXX. consists in the general character of many of their "omissions."[2]

Hebrew text, they must have spoilt the parallelisms; whereas we find that they have not done so, and that in fact the Alexandrian text has sometimes the advantage in this respect. But surely, it may be replied, for the Jew this idiom did not cease with the familiar use of his national speech. The Apocryphal Books, e.g. Wisdom, abound in it. Moreover we may observe that idioms and other forms of speech survive even with those who have wholly lost their hold upon that which was the mother tongue of previous generations. Such expressions as "he did it, *and he drunk*" (i.e. while he was drunk), in common use among the less educated (English speaking) classes in Ireland, are a literal rendering into English of an Irish idiom. See Dr Douglas Hyde's *Irish Folk Tales* ('*Beside the Fire*'), London, 1890, p. xlix. The same writer gives as another illustration the phrase "to let on," meaning, to pretend.

[1] See Scholz, p. 17.

[2] I have considered it sufficient for the present purpose, if the "omission" were attested by the Vatican MS. (B), as probably representing the original LXX. more closely than any other individual MS. Chap. i. 17 (om. *a*) is however almost the only case in these chapters, where that MS. stands unsupported.

And here we may distinguish

(*a*) Short expressions indicating that tendency to explanation or needless amplification so strongly marked in later Jewish (Palestinian or other) literature[1], e.g. the words "Jeremiah," and "I see" in chap. i. 11 (comp. 13), and also such short epithets as "king of Babylon," "king of Judah," etc. Some placed in this class may well have been marginal glosses, e.g. v. 28 *bis*, or an accidental repetition, e.g. viii. 3 (הנשארים), x. 25 (ואכלהו);

(*b*) Longer "omissions," viz. chaps. x. 6—8, 10, where the logical connexion of the Greek version is decidedly to be preferred to the unnatural arrangement of the Hebrew text[2];

(*c*) Passages or expressions which are found elsewhere in this or other Books in *both* texts, e.g. viii. 10$^{b}$—12 (cp. vi. 13—15).

The manner in which this class of variants may have arisen will better appear, if we glance at the position occupied by the Jews resident in Egypt, and, in particular, in Alexandria.

[1] Neh. chap. ix. on the one hand, and the Epistle of Jeremiah (= Baruch vi.), "certainly of Greek origin" (Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. ii. Vol. iii. Edinb. 1885, p. 195), on the other supply us with abundant illustration.

[2] See Workman, p. 126, and, for exhibition of the two texts of chap. x. 2—16 in parallel columns, Scholz, p. 60 ff. So for convenient comparison of the M.T. and LXX. in xxvii. 5—22 see W. Robertson Smith's *O.T. in the Jewish Church*, 2nd ed., London and Edinburgh, 1892, p. 104, or (for *vv.* 16—22) Scholz, pp. 62 ff. On xxix. 16—20 see Scholz, p. 165.

As early as B.C. 650 Psammetichus I. is said to have employed Jewish mercenaries in his war against Ethiopia[1]. There was also at an early period a strong Greek element in Egypt. We find Jer. (xlvi. 21) referring under the appellation of "fatted bullocks" to the "hired men," viz. Ionian and Carian soldiers, who according to Herodotus (ii. 163) were 30,000 in number, and lived in a fertile district on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile. After the overthrow of Egypt by Alexander and under the rule of the Ptolemies Greek influence and the Greek language became thoroughly established in Egypt; so that among the Jewish part of the population Hebrew as a living tongue disappeared, and was only retained for religious purposes, except so far as it was studied by the few from patriotic or literary motives.

It is clear that such of the sacred Books as depended for their preservation and study upon the devotion or literary interest of individuals only, would be liable to a far larger amount of alteration, intentional and otherwise, than those which, through their use in public worship, secured a larger amount of attention, and consequently, comparatively speaking, more of verbal accuracy in their trans-

[1] Schürer, Div. ii. Vol. ii. p. 227, quotes to this effect Aristeas in his *Epist.* ed. M. Schmidt, in Merx's *Archiv für wissenschaft. Erforschung des A.T.* Halle, 1870, Vol. i. pp. 253 ff. Aristeas was a court official of Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus, B.C. 285–247). His celebrated letter may also be found in Hody, *De Bibl. Textibus orig.* Oxford, 1705, pp. i—xxxvi.

mission[1]. At first after the Return it would appear that the Torah alone had this 'fence' round it, and it is not quite clear at what time, and owing to what causes, the custom of reading a lesson from 'the prophets' took its rise. But whether this use sprung from Antiochus's prohibition of the reading of the Law[2], or from the protest on the part of the orthodox against the Samaritans[3], who rejected the remainder of the Old Testament, we can easily see that between Jeremiah's own day, and such a date as accords with either of the reasons we have just mentioned[4], there had elapsed quite enough time to account for the introduction of additions (some of them probably, to begin with, in the form of marginal glosses or comments) to the original text of the prophet, additions which, as we shall presently note, on the whole indicate an early date by being couched in good Biblical Hebrew.

[1] Scholz strangely enough takes the opposite view (p. 226), considering that their use in the synagogue would directly induce additions to the text.

[2] So Vitringa, *De Symb. Vet.* pp. 1008 ff. Elias Levita (end of the 15th century) there quoted, seems the earliest to maintain this opinion.

[3] See Fürst, *Der Canon des A.T.* Leipzig, 1868, p. 51. There is no real authority for including, as he does, the Sadducees. The commencement of the Samaritans' formal schism may be placed in the time of Nehemiah (Neh. xiii. 28).

[4] See also Dr Ryle's conjecture as to the possible influence of Hellenic culture (*The Canon of the O.T.*, Macmillan, 1892, p. 108) where he also quotes Prof. Cheyne's suggestion (*The Origin of the Psalter*, London, 1891, p. 363), viz. "something like a reaction against the spirit of Ezra."

So far as we are warranted in forming an opinion from the very slender evidence in our possession, the reading of the later Books was not introduced into the public worship of the Egyptian Jews by any means so early as in Palestine[1]. The decree of Antiochus would not be likely to have any direct operation on this branch of the nation. It is true on the other hand that there were Samaritans living in Egypt, and that in the course of the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (B.C. 181—146) the dispute as to the rival claims of Jerusalem and Gerizim was brought before the king's tribunal (Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 3. 4). But they do not seem to have entered Egypt earlier than the time of Ptolemy I. (Lagi, B.C. c. 323—285)[2].

If then we are to suppose that the public reading of 'the prophets' (and consequent tendency towards the fixing of their text) in Palestine was a thing which long preceded their introduction into the Alexandrian worship[3], we may ask how it is that we do not find the state of the case with regard to

[1] We may observe that the Book of Wisdom comments on the Mosaic history but on none other; also that Philo's quotations from Books other than the Mosaic are comparatively few.

[2] See Jos. *Ant.* xii. 1. 1. πολλοὺς αἰχμαλώτους λαβὼν ἀπὸ...τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος...κατῴκισεν, ἅπαντας εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀγαγών.

[3] Philo gives three brief accounts of public worship in the synagogue (quoted by Schürer, Div. ii. Vol. ii. p. 76), in only one of which (Fragm. apud Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* viii. 7, 12—13, ed. Gaisf., from the first Book of the *Hypothetica*) he speaks, and even there somewhat vaguely (τῶν νόμων ἀκροᾶσθαι), of the reading of the Scriptures.

"omissions" in the LXX., or, as we may now venture to call them, additions in the Massoretic text of Jeremiah, exactly the reverse of that which actually presents itself? How is it that these are many, while the cases where we find words or passages in the LXX. unrepresented in the *M.T.* are comparatively few?

The answer is a simple one. Hebrew, as we have seen, soon ceased to be a living language among the Egyptian Jews. Their brethren who remained in Babylonian exile, as well as those who returned, were but gradually losing their hold upon the tongue of their forefathers. At Babylon they doubtless lived to a large extent apart from, and out of sympathy with, their conquerors, while at Jerusalem the *genius loci*, if nothing else, would naturally impel a considerable number to keep up their study of the Hebrew text, and not satisfy themselves with the Aramaic rendering of its contents, which, although needful in Nehemiah's time (Neh. viii. 8) for the mass of the people, is shewn by a large part of the post-exilic Biblical Hebrew literature not to have been required for some time after the Return.

In Egypt the change would be much more rapid. In the first place we find that a general destruction "by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence"[1] was prophesied for those who fled to Egypt on the overthrow of Jerusalem. It there-

[1] Jer. xlii. 17 ff.

fore appears that until Ptolemy I. (Lagi) introduced from Palestine captives and a large number of other settlers[1], the number of Jews in Egypt was inconsiderable.

Again, with those few, active pursuit of commerce, not retrospection, the energy and excitement of city life, not resentment and regret, must have been the prevalent characteristic, occupying, as they did, those two out of the five quarters of the city, which were close to the river[2]. Accordingly the Hebrew text, at least that of 'the prophets,' thus neglected, and soon to become unintelligible to the vast majority, remained comparatively free from the particular class of corruptions which we are now considering[3], while, even if the settlers, who arrived in Ptolemy Lagi's time, brought Hebrew MSS. of the sacred Books with them (which may well be doubted), these would seem to have had little, if any, influence upon the text of the Prophet, as already existing in Egypt.

On the whole we may claim to have established

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xii. 1 ff. So Schürer, as referred to on p. 8. Aristeas's words are, *τοὺς μὲν μετῴκιζεν, οὓς δὲ ᾐχμαλώτιζε.*

[2] As early as the foundation of Alexandria rights of citizenship were bestowed upon Jewish settlers. See Jos. *Apion.* ii. 4, *Ant.* xix. 5. 2, referred to by Schürer, Div. ii. Vol. ii. p. 228. See him also on pp. 244 ff.

[3] This seems a much more probable account than that of Scholz, who, as I have said, ascribes (p. 226) the number of additions found in the M.T. to the early use of it in Palestinian worship.

a good case against the M.T. in this respect; if we can shew, as the following list of "omissions"[1] to be examined in the critical notes claims to do, (*a*) that in very few cases, if any, are they necessary, (*b*) that in one or more cases they form a disturbing element[2].

Thus we may conclude that the "omissions" to be observed in the LXX. of Jeremiah, speaking generally, exist only in consequence of its nearer approximation to the original form of the Hebrew text; or, to express it more briefly, that this class of variants is, as a rule, *recensional*[3].

"Omissions"[4] (called *om.* in the Critical Notes) may be subdivided as follows:

[1] See p. 3.

[2] So nearly Scholz, p. 124. On p. 221 he compares the case of the additions to Esther and Daniel. Had these additions been composed earlier and written in Hebrew or Aramaic, they would have obtained Jewish recognition as canonical, just as the insertions in Jeremiah. An objection to the view which I am advocating might be considered to lie in the fact that those passages in the M.T. which have no counterpart in the LXX. are for the most part written in pure Hebrew. But among Palestinian Rabbis we have no reason to doubt that care would be taken to render the language of any such additions as a rule strictly Biblical. Yet the word יָאָתָה in chap. x. 7 has a late appearance, while the use of מֵאֵין for אֵין in the same verse (and perhaps in *v.* 6 also, lacking in the LXX.) points in the same direction.

[3] Examples on the other hand of probably non-recensional variants of this kind, i.e. *real* omissions through accident or otherwise on the part of the LXX., will be found in ii. 7, iii. 1, iv. 11, viii. 21, and more or less probable ones in i. 3, vii. 26, x. 13.

[4] In these and the following tables cases plainly doubtful as to

*a.* Short expressions indicating a tendency to explanation or amplification, or to accidental repetition. Some examples of this class may well have arisen through marginal glosses.

i. 4, 10, 11 *bis*, 13, (17,) 18 *ter*. ii. 6, 9, 19, (21,) (22,) 34. iii. 9, 10, 11, 17, 25. iv. (1,) (5,) (8,) 10, *12, 19, 23, 30. v. 14, 17, 20, (28 *bis*). vi. 6, 9, 11, 13 *bis*, (28,) 29. vii. 1, 3, 4, 8, (10,) (11,) 13 *bis*, (15,) 16, (20,) 21, *24, (27,) 28. viii. 3 *ter*, (5,) 8, (13,) 14 *bis*, 17. ix. 2, 5, 6, 14 *bis*, 16, 17, 21, (23). x. (3,) 5, 16 *bis*.

*b.* Longer "omissions."

x. 6—8, 10.

*c.* Passages or expressions which are found elsewhere in this or other Books in *both* texts.

i. 15. ii. 1—2, 17. iii. *7, 8, 10. v. 19. vii. 2 *bis*, 28. viii. 10$^{b}$—12. ix. 8, 9 *bis*, 12, 16 (x. 19).

class are placed within parentheses. An asterisk denotes some special feature of interest brought out in the critical notes. The numbering in all cases is that of the M.T. From viii. 23 to ix. 25 (inclusive) the numbering of O′ differs by one from that of the Heb. Scholz's list (pp. 48 ff.) of "omissions" requires some sifting. Taking the first ten chapters of the Book, we should make the following corrections in his list of "Kleinere Zusätze zum hebräischen Texte."

iii. 22. The words he gives occur also in the LXX. with one variation. For "*v.* 14" read *v.* 24. viii. 11. Instead of an addition of one word to the Hebrew, there are absent from the LXX. part of *v.* 10 and the whole of *vv.* 11, 12. v. 17. "regulos" is represented in the LXX., though by a loose translation. x. 16. Prefix *et* to "Israel virga."

*d.* "Omissions" which cannot be placed under any of the above.

i. 3, 5, 10 *bis*. ii. 2, *2—3, *7. iii. 1, 8. iv. 7, 11. v. *1, 8, 15, 26, (28 *bis*). vi. 23. vii. 26. viii. 21. ix. 4, 6. x. 13, *18, 25.

B. *Other divergences.*

By considering one particular class of variants which could be conveniently treated apart, we have attained to what is at least a presumption in favour of the form of the prophet's text represented by the LXX. We now proceed to the other kinds of variation which may be observed on comparison of the texts (additions, transpositions, substitutions etc.), in order that we may enquire whether these also are (i) all recensional, or (ii) all non-recensional, or lastly, whether they are not (iii) a mixture of both, and capable to some extent of a corresponding classification.

The second of these three alternatives may be at once put aside, as failing to account for the phenomena. The first of them is virtually that adopted by Prof. Workman in the work already mentioned. His view is clearly given in the following sentences:

"In this discussion the variations are not in any sense, or, indeed, in any instance, regarded as intentional. They are regarded simply as textual characteristics, or as recensional peculiarities. This

theory assumes that the translator, in every case, endeavoured to reproduce the text before him, as literally and as faithfully as the genius of his language would justly allow....An occasional instance of each class of variation may have arisen from oversight, on the part of the translator or transcriber, but not properly from intention. A variation, moreover, may have been due sometimes to accident, but never to design."[1]

The latter part of Prof. Workman's book consists of a "Conspectus of the Variations," produced by printing so much as is needed of the M.T., and, in parallel columns with it, the text of the LXX. rendered literally into Hebrew. Thus, if his theory be sound, we have before our eyes side by side (so far as the two texts differ) the older (and better) Hebrew text, and its corrupt counterpart, which received Jewish sanction, and thus passed into the Christian Church.

Both Dr Driver[2] and Prof. H. P. Smith[3] have commented on this theory, and besides other criticisms have pointed out with abundant illustrations, to quote the words of the latter[4], that the "Conspectus contains a number of alleged readings of the Greek translators which are probably not variants at all." It does not, in fact, distinguish

[1] pp. 16, 17.
[2] *Expositor*, 3rd Ser. Vol. ix. (1889), pp. 321—337.
[3] *Journal of Bibl. Lit.* Vol. ix. (1890—1891), pp. 107—117.
[4] p. 110.

between variations which are really, and those only apparently, recensional.

My object in the pages that follow is to deal with the question in a somewhat different manner, and, by a tolerably minute examination of the first ten chapters of the Book, to indicate the complex character of the problem, by calling attention to the many causes which have combined to produce divergences. At the same time I attempt to shew approximately[1] the comparative share which each of these causes has had in the production of so striking a result.

Prof. Workman tells us[2] that "there must have been a worthy cause for such remarkable divergences." It is this assumption of a *single* cause which vitiates his whole result. He tells us in effect that the reason why we possess what amounts to a double text of Jeremiah is that the LXX. translated with the most admirable literalness and fidelity a recension which was immensely superior to the M.T., in fact, one which was well-nigh perfect.

On the contrary, as we shall see in detail, the divergences are to be attributed, not to one but to many causes; and it has seemed important to treat separately the "omissions," as being on a different footing from those other classes of variants, with which we now proceed to deal. These,

[1] By means (as presently explained) of the letters prefixed to most of the critical notes. In the case of very minute additions however I do not intend the list to be quite exhaustive.

[2] p. 11.

unlike the former class, we shall see to include a large amount of the non-recensional element, and to owe their origin to causes varying much in the extent of their operation.

They may be grouped as follows, while for detailed comment the reader is referred to the critical notes, the Greek letter at the head of the note in each case indicating the class under which the variant falls or appears to fall.

1. Additions in the LXX. (*a*).

It will be convenient to subdivide these as regards their origin. Some are obviously introduced from more or less parallel passages (Par.); others may be considered as interpretative or Midrashic (Midr.); while others again, conveniently classed under the above general heading, are really combinations of two readings or conflations (Confl.)[1].

[1] There are of course a few cases where the "addition" appears to be a part of the genuine text. Of these ix. 25 [Gk. 26] furnishes an interesting example.

It may here be noted that Scholz in his list (pp. 57 ff.) of "Kleinere Zusätze zum griechischen Texte," makes no attempt at any subdivision, and thus places under the same heading additions of very various origin. We may also make the following corrections in his list, so far as it deals with these chapters: i. 1 omit ὃς. iii. 18 insert καὶ before ἀπό. For *v.* 22 read *v.* 21. iv. 28 is a case of transposition, not addition. v. 4 is a case of loose translation, not addition. vi. 1 is a misreading of the Heb. on the part of the LXX., not an addition. For *v.* 12 read *v.* 16. *v.* 9, read τοῦ κακῶς εἶναι ὑμῖν. *v.* 16, a loose translation, not an addition. *v.* 26, a mistranslation, not an addition. ix. 4, a wrong division of words, not an addition. ix. 6, the word probably represents the original Heb. text. *v.* 22, read τῆς γῆς ὑμῶν. x. 2, a misreading of the Heb. text, not an addition.

*a.* Par. i. 15, 18. ii. 17, 19, 28. iii. *7, 8, 17. v. *17. vii. 4, 10, 11. ix. 13.

*b.* Midr. i. 1, 9. ii. 20, 31. iii. 12 *bis*, *22. iv. 2, 15, (16). v. 27. vi. *13, *16 *bis*. vii. 28. viii. 23. ix. 12. x. 12[1].

*c.* Confl. ii. 29. iv. *1, 19, 29. viii. *7, 16, 21. ix. *15. x. 9, 20.

*d.* Other additions.

i. 1, 14. ii. 6, 13, 23. iii. *1, 8, (for 18 see λ, p. 21), (for 19 see η, p. 20). iv. 4, 10, 26. v. 18. vii. 13, 18 *ter*, 24, 31, 34. viii. 2, 13. ix. (*6,) 21, 23, *25.

2. Transpositions of words or letters, (β). Here we may distinguish between

*a.* Transpositions which appear to have been made for the sake of *sound*:

ii. 19, 32. viii. 20, (comp. for parallel phenomena iv. 31. viii. 2. ix. 4 [5]).

*b.* Other transpositions:

ii. *15. iii. 2, 9. iv. 26, 28. v. 11. vi. *13. vii. 9. ix. 1. x. 4, 5.

3. Variations arising solely from substitutions of words or letters (including ו or י consonantal), with or without vowel change, (γ).

i. 2 *bis*, 4, 14, 18. ii. *6, 12, (15,) 16 *bis*, 19, 20, 21, (23,) 24 *ter*, 31, 33, 34. iii. 3 (*bis*), 4, 8, 15 *bis*, 20, 21, 22. iv. 1, 4, 7, 20 *bis*, 29 *bis*. v. 2, *6,

[1] For Midrashic renderings which do not involve *additions* to the LXX. see p. 21.

7, 10 *bis*, 17, 24. vi. 2 *ter*, *6, 9, 14, 18 *bis*, 19, 23, (27,) 29. vii. 29. viii. 3, 6 *bis*, 14. ix. 9, 10, 14, *16, 18. x. 2, 3, 4, *13, (17,) 18, 19 *bis*, 20 *bis*.

4. Inaccuracies (other than omissions) caused by ignorance of the meaning of the Hebrew word, and arising generally from its rarity, or rare use in the sense it bears in the individual passage, (δ).

(i. 6). ii. 6, 23, (23,) 24, 25, 31 *bis*. iii. 2, *17, 21. v. 4. vi. 3, *5, 6. vii. 29. viii. 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17. ix. 9, *13. x. 20.

5. Differences consisting only in vocalisation and pointing (including ו or י vocalic), (ε).

i. 12. ii. 13, 17, 19, 23, 25, 27, 34. iii. 1, 5, 16 *ter*, 19 *bis*, *22. iv. 4, 5, 6, 11, 19, 21, 31. v. 6, 14. vi. 6 *bis*, 15, 18, (20,) 23 *bis*, 27 *bis*, 30. vii. 31, (*32). viii. 6, 7, 13, 16. ix. 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 19 *bis*. x. 3, 14, 24 *bis*.

6. Different division of words, (ζ).

ii. 20, 33. v. 6. vi. 25. viii. *18. ix. *4.

7. Errors which may have arisen from words written in a contracted form, or wrongly supposed to be a contraction, (η).

ii. 2–3, (11,) 27 *bis*, 37. iii. 6, 7, 19. iv. 17. v. (1,) 24. vi. 7, 11, (12,) 15. viii. 7, 14, 18. x. 17.

8. One root mistaken for another of kindred form, (θ).

ii. (*36). iii. 6 *ter*, 9. iv. 16, 19, *22. v. 8. vi. 1. vii. 10.

9. A root taken in a wrong sense, which is borne however elsewhere by that root, (ι).

viii. 15.

10. Error owing to the influence of Aramaic idiom, (κ).

iii. 2, 5. vii. 8.

11. Inaccuracies arising from national or local feeling, deference to Egyptian susceptibilities, desire to avoid discredit or misconception, or other such considerations, (λ).

ii. 16, 18, 29. iii. 18. v. 13.

12. Inaccuracies arising from the desire to avoid harsh language as to Jeremiah or Jews generally, (μ).

i. 17. viii. 2. ix. 21, 25.

13. Midrashic changes, not being additions, (ν).

ii. *23. iii. 1, 19. iv. 30. vi. 16.

14. Variations arising from miscellaneous, often unknown, causes, (ξ),

*a.* from desire for parallelism, harmonizing, or smoothness.

i. 7. ii. 19, 30. iii. 18. iv. 3, (8). v. 4, (28). vi. 4, 19, 23. viii. 2. ix. 18.

*b.* from errors in the M.T.

ii. 30. (vii. *18).

*c.* from errors of ear.

ii. 18, 33. (v. 31). (x. 21).

*d.* from liturgical reasons.
(iii. 16. v. 15).

*e.* from insertion or omission of the negative.
ii. 25, 31 *bis*. iv. 1. v. 2, 3, 10.

*f.* from motives of reverence.
v. 12.

*g.* from lack of grammatical knowledge.
vii. 28.

*h.* from the influence of Hebrew linguistic usage.
ii. 2.

*i.* from other causes.
i. 16 *bis*. ii. (11,) 13 *bis*, 17, 21, 22, 23 *bis*, 24, 25, 26, 28, 31. iii. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23. iv. 1 *quinquies*, 4, 5, 7 *bis*, 8, 10 *bis*, 11, 13 *bis*, 14, 15, 20 *ter*, 21, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31 *bis*. v. (1,) 13, (28,) *31. vi. 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 *bis*, 13, 15 *ter*, 21, *22 *bis*, 23, 29. vii. 4, 11, 16, 20 *bis*, 21, 23, 24, 25, 31, (*32,) 32. viii. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 16. ix. 2 *bis*, 3, 4, 7 *bis*, 9, 11, 15, 19, 21, 23. x. 1, 2, 15, 17, *18 *bis*, (19,) 20 *bis*, 23, 24.

It need scarcely be said that some of these variations are doubtless nothing more than corruptions of the original text of the LXX. Such cases we find e.g. in iii. 6 (πορνεῦσαι), v. 31 (ἐπεκρότησαν), vi. 4 (ἐκλείπουσιν), vi. 19 (τῶν λόγων μου), and to these we might add ix. 21 [22] (ἔσονται). Nevertheless certain, or even highly probable, cases of corruption play but a small part

in these chapters[1]. It follows that, so long as the sense offered us by the LXX. in any passage is a reasonable one, its comparative freedom from *obvious* corruptions strengthens its claim upon our acceptance of its reading.

We may note with regard to a conflation in particular, that it is composed (*a*) of two *readings*, in which case it may or may not present us with the LXX's original text, or (*b*) of two *renderings*, in which case we are certainly dealing with a corrupt reading of the Greek.

A few words should be said as to indications of illegibility in the MS. or MSS. used by the translators. Uncertainties in the text arising from this cause need not surprise us. While both the public reading of the Torah, and the careful preservation of its rolls in the synagogue, would tend to secure that portion of the Scriptures against corruption or other injury, we have reason to think (see p. 9) that such protective influences were not at work in the case of the other Books till a considerably later period. When we take into account the Jewish view of these Books, as inspired indeed, but inferior to the Law, and to be classed with oral tradition under the common title Ḳabbala, when we consider the probable paucity of copies in Egypt, and further, how easily the letters on a huge roll of leather with ink of a kind to be easily

[1] More rarely still do we find cases, e.g. x. 9, where both texts shew *clear* signs of corruption.

washed off, could be rendered obscure or illegible[1], we shall have little difficulty in believing that the LXX. translators had to face obstacles arising from such causes as these.

Obviously it is impossible to do more than indicate cases where there seems ground for believing that variations between the Hebrew and Greek texts had for their origin MS. illegibility. Apart then from the many instances where we may well suppose a small portion of one word—it may be a single letter—to have been indistinct or obliterated, we find now and then a group of loose or faulty renderings, which suggest this as a very possible source of error. Such groups are to be found e.g. in ii. 21–23, iii. 3, 4, x. 25, and see especially x. 17–22.

To sum up briefly the most important conclusions to which we seem to be led by the above-mentioned considerations, as expanded and illustrated in the critical notes which follow:

1. The MS. or MSS. upon which the translators worked shewed a fairly accurate text, though here and there in somewhat bad preservation.

2. The tendency to diffuseness, characteristic of later Judaism, began, probably soon after the prophecies were collected, to expand by means of slight additions the original Hebrew text.

[1] See W. Robertson Smith, *O. T. in the Jewish Church* (2nd ed.), pp. 71, 161 with notes containing references to authorities for the above statements.

3. This tendency was likely specially to affect the writings of Jeremiah, as a prophet whose memory was of marked interest to the post-exilic Jews. Witness the well-known traditions which grew up around his name.

4. This tendency, though distinctly traceable in the Hebrew text upon which the LXX. worked, operated much more slightly among Egyptian Jews than with their brethren elsewhere, owing to differences (*a*) of language, (*b*) of surroundings and modes of life.

5. The character of the translators' work was on the whole good, ranging from fair accuracy to literalness even to a fault, wherever no reason intervened inducing or compelling them to be inaccurate. Among such reasons we may trace the following.

(*a*) Subjective reasons:

(i) A desire for smoothness, e.g. a deviation induced by considerations of sound.

(ii) A desire to interpret by alteration or addition (Midrashic changes).

(iii) National or local feeling.

(iv) A desire to avoid harsh language towards Jeremiah or Jews generally.

(*b*) Objective reasons:

(i) Illegibility of the Hebrew text.

(ii) Ignorance of the meaning of the Hebrew word or expression.

(iii) Misconception of the word, owing to the sense which it had come to bear in the Aramaic. This however was but very slight in its effects, as we might expect.

(iv) Slips of eye or ear.

6. They naturally were led into some errors in consequence of not always choosing wisely among two or more possible alternatives, e.g.

(i) Wrong vocalisation or wrong division of words.

(ii) Errors arising from contractions, or supposed contractions.

(iii) The mistaking of one root for another of kindred form.

In the notes which follow, I have taken the readings of uncial MSS. (BℵAQ) from Dr Swete's edition of the LXX.[1], making use of his lettering also, on the few occasions when it has seemed needful to note alterations by later hands. For the evidence of cursive MSS., of the other Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) as well as of the Syro-Hexaplaric (SH.) version[2], I have made use of Field's *Hexapla*.

[1] Cambridge, 1887—1894. In one or two passages, where there seemed a possibility of doubt, I have verified B from the autotype.

[2] Except in a few cases where it has seemed important to verify afresh.

# CRITICAL NOTES.

i. 1. *a d.*[1] דִּבְרֵי. τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ὃ ἐγένετο ἐπί. The balance is probably just in favour of the M.T., as being a somewhat unusual form, found however in the opening of Amos and Ḳoheleth. O′ gives us a very frequent introductory form, with this difference that we should have expected Κυρίου (יהוה) instead of θεοῦ. The θεοῦ of *v.* 2 (see note there) may account for this variation.

*a b.* אֲשֶׁר. ὃς κατῴκει. An interpretative (Midrashic) insertion, by no means implying a variant from the M.T.

2. *γ.* יְהוָֹה. τοῦ θεοῦ (A θεοῦ). It is unlikely that O′ would, without any apparent reason, violate their rule, carefully to distinguish the words for Lord and God. The Heb. may easily have altered an original אֱלֹהִים, so as to correspond with the opening words of *v.* 4. Q, 22, 36, and others (and so SH.) have Κυρίου.

[1] For the meaning of the letters thus prefixed to most of the notes see pp. 13 ff., 18 ff.

γ. אָמוֹן. Ἀμώς. So in 2 K. [4 K.] xxi. 18 ff. (but there A has Ἀμμών), 2 Chr. xxxiii. 20 ff., through the confusion on the part of O′ between ן and ו. Here Compl. (and so SH.) has Ἀμῶν. It seems improbable that O′'s Hebrew text was wrongly spelt in all these places.

3. *om. d.* עַד־תֹּם. ἕως. The omission of תֹּם probably arose from the recollection of such a passage as xxxix. [xlvi.] 2, or lii. 6 ff. We cannot be sure whether it was done by O′, or had an earlier origin.

4. γ and *om. a.* אֵלַי לֵאמֹר. πρὸς αὐτόν. O′'s reading is the better of the two, that of M.T. being adopted for smoothness, and followed by AQ, III. 23, 41, and others (πρός με, adding λέγων), and so SH. Compl. Ald.

5. *om. d.* מֵרֶחֶם. O′ *vacat*, but B^ab mg ℵAQ repair the clearly accidental omission of ἐκ μήτρας.

6. (δ.) אֲהָהּ. ὁ ὤν. So also in xiv. 13, xxxii. [xxxix.] 17, while iv. 10 has simply Ὦ. In Ex. iii. 14 (*bis*) ὁ ὢν translates אֶהְיֶה. But perhaps the original reading in Jeremiah was in all four places ω, whence came ὢν (comp. ἀκούων for ἀκούω in iv. 22, and τῶν λόγων for τῷ λόγῳ in vi. 19), and then ὁ ὤν. In favour of this view is the fact that אָ (though in Jud. vi. 22 it is Ἀ ἆ) is rendered ὦ in 2 K. [4 K.] iii. 10, vi. 5, 15 (in this last A omits); so הָהּ is ὦ ὦ in Ezek. xxx. 2.

אֲדֹנָי יְהוִֹה. *δέσποτα Κύριε.* See on ii. 22.

7. ξ *a.* עַל. *πρός.* The frequent employment of אֶל where עַל would be more usual is a feature which the M.T. of Jeremiah shares with the Books of Samuel. For instances in the latter see Dr Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Sam.*, p. 77, as well as for the much less frequent cases of the converse use, which the Hebrew text here illustrates. From this looseness of practice a translator would feel the more free to give the smoother rendering. Wo. however (p. 198) makes it a case "that may be explained by dictation or oral transmission."

8. נְאֻם יְהוָֹה. *λέγει Κύριος.* This is the normal rendering (*εἶπεν* in i. 19, but AQ *λέγει*). It may be noted that in something less than one quarter of the total number of occurrences *φησὶν* is the verb used (the only cases in chs. i—x. being ii. 3, and in Q ix. 2 [3], 5 [6]). Hence Wo. in those cases considers O′ to have found אמר in their text. This seems quite unnecessary.

9. *a b.* אֶת־יָדוֹ. O′ adds *πρός με.*

10. *om. a.* וּלְהַאֲבִיד וְלַהֲרֹס. *καὶ ἀπολλύειν.* Probably the briefer text is to be preferred both here and (still more clearly) in the similar passages xviii. 7, xxxi. [xxxviii.] 28. The natural shrinking which they would have from calling

the attention of foreigners to their own national sufferings at the hand of God, while it may account for the omission of a whole passage such as xxix. [xxxvi.] 16–20, would hardly form a sufficient reason for leaving out one only of a series of verbs, had they found it in their Heb. text. Aq. Theod. support M.T. SH. makes both verbs to be additions from the Heb. text; so St Jer.

*om. d.* עַל־הַגּוֹיִם. *ἐπὶ ἔθνη.*

*om. d.* וְעַל־הַמַּמְלָכוֹת. *καὶ* (AQ* *vid. καὶ ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς*) *βασιλείας.*

11. *om. a.* יִרְמְיָהוּ. (B *vacat*) ℵAQ Ἱερεμία.

*om. a.* אֲנִי רֹאֶה (and so in *v.* 13). O′ *vacat.* Probably both this and the preceding are Midrashic insertions in the Heb. (marked with an asterisk in 88 and SH. here and *v.* 13). In the somewhat similar passage xxiv. 3, as Wo. (p. 283, notes *h* and *k*) somewhat obscurely points out, the words א׳ ר׳ are absent from the Heb. as well.

12. *ε.* דְּבָרִי. *τοὺς λόγους μου*, reading דְּבָרַי.

13. *om. a.* אֲנִי רֹאֶה. See on *v.* 11.

14. *a d.* מִצָּפוֹן. *ἀπὸ προσώπου βορρᾶ.*

*γ.* תִּפָּתַח. *ἐκκαυθήσεται* (Aq. Symm. *ἀνοιχθήσεται*). O′ desired to connect the Heb. word etymologically with the preceding נָפוּחַ (perhaps read by them נָפוֹחַ Niph. ptcp. from פּוּחַ), *ὑποκαιόμενον*

(Aq. Symm. *φυσηθέντα* or *ἐμφυσηθέντα*), pointed by Mass. as pass. ptcp. Ḳal of נפח. פוח although properly *to breathe, to blow*, is used in Hiph. of kindling in a literal (Ezek. xxi. 36) or metaphorical (Prov. xxix. 8) sense. Hence they may have chosen to read תפחח, and then either cancelled one ח or else read the word as a Po'lal of פוח.

15. *om. c.* מִשְׁפְּחוֹת. O′ *vacat.* Aq. Symm. *συγγενείας* (a certain correction of *εὐγενείας*, which SH. gives as their reading). The Heb. seems to have been suggested by xxv. 9.

*a a.* מַמְלְכוֹת. *τὰς βασιλείας...τῆς γῆς.* The addition, taken apparently from xv. 4, xxiv. 9 etc., may well have been in the first instance a marginal gloss. Accordingly its position is uncertain, O′ putting it after *βορρᾶ.* There would appear to have been an early confusion in the Heb. text between מַמְלְכוֹת and מַלְכֵי, of which 88 and SH. retain traces.

16. *ξ i.* וְדִבַּרְתִּי מִשְׁפָּטַי אוֹתָם. *καὶ λαλήσω πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ κρίσεως.* A free translation.

*ξ i.* וַיְקַטְּרוּ. *καὶ ἔθυσαν.* In Hos. iv. 13; 2 Chr. xxv. 14 alone elsewhere is קִטֵּר rendered (without variant) by *θύειν.* *Θυμιᾶν* (*θυμιάζειν*) mostly represents this root both in Jer. and elsewhere. See Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance to LXX. etc.*, Oxford, 1892, s. v. *θυμ.*

17. (*om. a.*) אֲלֵיהֶם. B *vacat*. The word is not likely to have been omitted, if genuine. It is supported however by אAQ and SH.

μ. פֶּן־אֲחִתְּךָ לִפְנֵיהֶם. *μηδὲ πτοηθῇς ἐναντίον αὐτῶν*. SH. follows the Heb. in its text, O′ in its margin. M.T. is plainly right. Its apparently harsh language doubtless led to the substitution, and would certainly not have been introduced by an 'improver' of the text. It survives in a Greek form only in MS. 88, and that corruptly, *μήποτε πτοήσει* (corr. *πτοήσω*) *σε*. St Jer. however testifies to it as the reading of O′ ("ne forte timere te faciam"), while giving apparently as a preferable alternative "nec enim timere te faciam vultum eorum." Compl. has *μηδὲ πτοηθῆναί σε ποιήσω*, not on the authority of any Greek MS., but simply by way of an attempt at rendering O′ as given above in St Jer.'s Latin. So elsewhere; e.g. in ii. 1, 2. With a view further to mitigate harshness there was also added without substantial change (אAQ have the *ἐγώ*) the last clause of *vv.* 8, 19; all three verses being on the whole similar in thought, and of a specially encouraging, not threatening, character.

18. *om. a.* וּלְעַמּוּד בַּרְזֶל. O′ *vacat*.

γ. וּלְחֹמוֹת. *καὶ ὡς τεῖχος* (וּלְחֹמָה). The *matres lectionis* (see Scholz, pp. 38, 114) seem to have been less regularly inserted in the time of O′.

*a a.* נְחֹשֶׁת. *χαλκοῦν*, to which is added *ὀχυροῦν* (but B[b]AQ *-ρόν*, א *ἰσχυρόν*), apparently to explain the preceding figure, and suggested by xv. 20, where *ὀχυρόν* (M.T. בְּצוּרָה) comes in O′. Here it spoils the parallelism.

*om. a.* עַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ. O′ *vacat.* Aq. *ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.*

*om. a.* לְכֹהֲנֶיהָ. O′ *vacat.* Theod., 88, SH. supply, but with an asterisk; 22, 36, and others without one.

ii. 1, 2, *om. c.* וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר׃ הָלֹךְ וְקָרָאתָ בְאָזְנֵי יר׳ לא׳. *καὶ εἶπεν.* SH. and St Jer. testify to the absence of the clauses from O′ (inserted with asterisks by SH., and stated by St Jer. to be added from Theod.). Compl. under these circumstances (see on i. 17) retranslates St Jer.'s Latin. See Field *ad loc.* The Heb. may have been suggested to a transcriber from the many parallel expressions (xxix. 29; xxxvi. 6, 15, etc.).

2. *om. d.* לָךְ. O′ *vacat.* Theod. has *σοί.*

*ξ h.* כְּלוּלֹתָיִךְ. *τελειώσεως αὐτοῦ* (א* *τελιώτητός σου τῷ.* AQ *τελειώσεώς σου τοῦ*). The translators have transferred to the Greek equivalent the special turn which Heb. usage has in this word given to the sense borne by the root form.

SH. testifies virtually to *νυμφείων σου* as the rendering of Aq. and Symm., although owing to the form of spelling (*νυμφίων*) in the MS. which it used, it renders "thy betrothed." So Field *ad loc.*

2, 3. *om.* *d* and *η*. O′'s MS. seems to have erred both in defect and excess, omitting 'במ' בא ׳לא זר (whose genuineness it is hard to doubt), and writing twice over the words אחרי קדש ישראל. Perplexed by the repetition, they read אחרי on its second occurrence as (יהוה=) ׳אמר י. For this and other indications in this Book and elsewhere that O′ found abbreviations in their text, and so could assume them as something familiar, see Dr Driver, *Notes on the Heb. Text of the Books of Samuel. Introd.* p. lxx.

6. δ. וְשׁוּחָה. *καὶ ἀβάτῳ*. The root seems to have troubled the translators of this Book. Comp. their rendering in xviii. 20, and (ק׳) 22 (its only other occurrences in Jer.). Hence they were willing to render as though it were שַׁמָּה (שְׁמָמָה), often elsewhere (vi. 8, xii. 10 etc.) rendered *ἄβατος*, and of very frequent occurrence.

Obs. that the M.T. supports Bℵ against A for the order of the words *ἀπ. κ. ἀβ.*

γ. וְצַלְמָוֶת. *καὶ ἀκάρπῳ*. Either the MS. was indistinct, or a different and less skilful translator may have been at work: for 'צ is rendered correctly (if we accept its Mass. pronunciation) in xiii. 16.

The word which ἀκ. represents is clearly גַּלְמוּד, and it would be tempting to follow Wo. in assuming that this somewhat rare word (Is. xlix. 21; Job iii. 7, xv. 34, xxx. 3) was not only O′'s reading, but also the original Hebrew here. Unfortunately however for his view, everywhere else it is an *adjective*, and so (Job xv. 34 is not a case in point) would need the fem. ending, not likely to be omitted, especially in the face of the parallelism just preceding (בארץ ערבה ושוחה). See specially Is. xlix. 21. If O′ read the word as גַּלְמוּד (not גַּלְמוּדָה), it shews that even those Greek-speaking Jews who possessed a knowledge of their national tongue, had lost some of their feeling for grammatical Heb. usage. (For other passages which seem to throw light on the amount of grammatical knowledge possessed by the translators see Introductory chapter, p. 5.) Aq. Symm. Theod. had *καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου*. St Jer., quoting Theod., shews ("imagine mortis") that he himself considered the expression to be made up of the roots צלם and מות.

*om. a* and *a d.* אִישׁ. *om.* B*A (Q *ἀνήρ.* ℵ *ανος*), all adding however *οὐθέν*. אִישׁ is an easy amplification for a Heb. copyist.

אָדָם שָׁם. *ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ* (ℵQ *ἐκ. υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*). MSS. 22, 23, 26, and others, and so SH. and

also Compl., have υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, which St Jer. gives as the reading of O′.

7. *om. d.* אָרֶץ. O′ *vacat.* Taking 'כ as the name of the well-known hill, as they also do in iv. 26, they thought 'א inappropriate. Were it not for the latter passage (where see note) one might be inclined (with Scholz) to consider the 'א as an interpretative addition on the part of M.T. SH. in the text follows O′, but in the margin agrees with M.T.

8. הַתּוֹרָה. τοῦ νόμου, but ℵAQ add μου and so SH.

9. *om. a.* נְאֻם־יְהוָה. B*ℵ* *om.* But λέγει κύριος is found in AQ 23, 26, and others. So SH. and Compl. M.T. is an insertion by a copyist for clearness.

11. (ξ *i* or η.) גּוֹי. ἔθνη. This need not be anything more than a loose rendering. But O′ may have read the word 'גוי = גּוֹיִם.

12. γ. וְשַׂעֲרוּ חָרְבוּ. καὶ ἔφριξεν (after ἔφρ. MSS. 33, 36, and others, and so Ald., add ἡ γῆ. So SH. marg.) ἐπὶ πλεῖον. M.T. is clearly right; but the two imperatives with asyndeton were rough; so O′ avoided the second by reading הַרְבֵּה, Aq. Symm. the first by reading שְׁעָרָיו (καὶ πύλαι αὐτοῦ).

13. *a d.* רָעוֹת. καὶ πονηρά, probably reading a conjunction in their text, for they would scarcely

go out of their way to introduce so Hebraic a construction.

ξ *i.* לַחְצֹב. *καὶ ὤρυξαν*, a free rendering.

ξ *i.* בֹּארֹת בֹּארֹת. *λάκκους*. O′ practically deleted one of the words, as though they thought that it had been written twice over in their copy.

ε. יָכִלוּ. *δυνήσονται...συνέχειν*, reading יְכִלוּ. It so happens that nowhere else in O.T. except in x. 10 (which is lacking in O′) does the Hiph. of כול appear with ׳ defective.

15. (γ.) וַיָּשִׁיתוּ. *οἳ ἔταξαν*, very possibly reading שָׁשׁוּ.

β *b.* נִצְּתוּ ק׳ (נִצְּתָה כ׳). *κατεσκάφησαν*, reading נִתְּצוּ. It is noteworthy that conversely where M.T. has the expression עָרָיו נִתְּצוּ (iv. 26) O′ has *ἐμπεπυρισμέναι* (AQ add *πυρὶ*), reading נִצְּתוּ (to which Wo. needlessly adds בָּאֵשׁ). O′'s rendering of נִצְּתוּ in ix. 9 [10] is probably to be otherwise explained. See note there.

16. λ. נֹף. *Μέμφεως*. Noph was a colloquial form of Memphis. See Sm. *Dict. of Bible*, s. v. Noph.

γ. יִרְעוּךְ. *ἔγνωσάν σε*, reading ד for ר. The text of A.V. ("have broken") derives from רעע.

γ. קָדְקֹד. *καὶ κατέπαιζόν σου*, either reading וַיִּרְקְדוּ (וַיִּרַקֵּד), or seeing some form of the root

קלס, which appears (Hithp.) in 2 K. ii. 23, and is rendered *κατέπαιζον* (so *ἐμπαίξονται*, Ezek. xxii. 5; comp. Hab. i. 10, and קַלָּסָה, *ἐμπαιγμὸς*, Ezek. xxii. 4). This seems more likely than the hypothesis of Scholz, who (p. 36) connects O''s rendering with the root קדף.

17. *ξ i.* הֲלוֹא־זֹאת תַּעֲשֶׂה־לָּךְ עָזְבֵךְ. (16) *οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησέν σοι τὸ καταλιπεῖν σε;* Puzzled by the construction they rendered in defiance of grammar. Pesh. and Vulg. render the verb as 3rd p. fut. Niph. (תֵּעָשֶׂה).

*ε* and *a a.* אֶת־יְהוָה. (16) *ἐμὲ* (17) *λέγει Κύριος*, reading אִתִּי and supplying נְאֻם, perhaps in order to harmonize with the last part of *v.* 19.

*om. c.* בְּעֵת מוֹלִכֵךְ בַּדָּרֶךְ. O' *vacat.* An amplification, suggested by *v.* 6.

18. *λ.* שִׁחוֹר. *Γηών.* The root שחר, *to be black, muddy* ("nigra fecundat arena," Verg. *Ge.* iv. 291), is used in Cant. i. 5, 6 of a tanned face, in Job xxx. 30 of a diseased skin, in Lam. iv. 8 as a symbol of intense blackness of visage, as the result of starvation. It is significant that in all cases of the occurrence of the substantive (Jos. xiii. 3; Is. xxiii. 8; 1 Chr. xiii. 5) O' avoids its transliteration, as though fearful of Egyptian disapproval. Here however, unlike the other cases where they have gone further afield for a rendering, they adopt the name of the river (Gen. ii. 13, where O' reads

as here) which is identified with the Nile by Jos. *Ant.* i. 1. 3. The other Greek translators (see SH. marg.) had no such difficulty and gave Σιώρ.

*ξ c.* נָהָר. *ποταμῶν.* The plural is a slip, which may well have been caused by the occurrence of Γηὼν as the last word of the parallel clause.

19. *β a.* רָעָתֵךְ and מְשֻׁבוֹתַיִךְ. The proper renderings (*ἡ κακία σου* and *ἡ ἀποστασία σου*) are transposed in O′, it would appear for the sake of sound, inasmuch as thus the p, s, and t sounds come together, and then the k sounds. Similar transpositions occur ii. 32, (iv. 31,) viii. 2, 20, x. 4. Scholz (p. 110) makes them to be errors of 'ear' in dictation; but it seems unlikely that they are to be assigned indiscriminately to that source.

*om. a.* רַע וָמָר. *πικρόν.* רַע and the conjunction were inserted, so as to carry on the duplication of expression existing in the earlier part of the verse.

*ε* and *a a.* אֶת־יְהוָה. *ἐμέ, λέγει* Κύριος. See on 17.

*γ.* וְלֹא פַחְדָּתִי אֵלַיִךְ. *καὶ οὐκ εὐδόκησα* (AQ* *ηὐδ.*) *ἐπὶ σοί.* O′ did not perceive that the suffix of 'פ is objective, *fear of* (*towards*) *me.* Hence they seem to have chosen to read בָּחַרְתִּי, in spite of the fact that that verb is not elsewhere found constructed with אֶל.

N.B. אִתֵּךְ, suggested by Wo., looks a somewhat portentous word.

*ξ a.* אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה צְבָאוֹת. Κύριος ὁ θεός σου 2°. This seems a tolerably clear case of harmonizing on the part of O′. There is no apparent reason why, if the expression here had been originally identical with that in the earlier part of the verse, it would have been altered by a Heb. copyist. See also on *v.* 22.

20. שָׁבַרְתִּי and נִתַּקְתִּי. *συνέτριψας* and *διέσπασας*; but Q, 22, 23, 26, and others, apparently with SH. (ܦܣܩܬܝ), have *διέρρηξας*; and so Compl. Ald. M.T. is probably wrong in pointing these verbs as 1st p. s., instead of making them 2nd s. f., as M.T. itself has done in the case of למדתי in *v.* 33. Obs. that there is no *καὶ* in B or א connecting the verbs.

*γ.* לֹא אֶעֱבוֹר ק׳. *οὐ δουλεύσω* (אֶעֱבוֹד כ׳). ד was changed to ר when the preceding verbs were taken to be in the 1st person.

*a b.* *σοι* is Midrashic (אAQ[a] *om.*).

*ζ.* אַתְּ צֹעָה. *διαχυθήσομαι*, reading אֶתְצַעֶה, which they seem to have considered a possible form of Hithp. of צעה. SH. gives Aq., Theod. as having *συγγινομένη* (probably a corruption of *σὺ γινομένη*) *ἐν στρώματι πορνῇ*.

רַעֲנָן. *κατασκίου* (comp. *ἀλσώδους* in iii. 6).

Wo.'s substitute עֲבֹת (rendered by *κατ.* Ezek. xx. 28) is quite a needless change. *Κατ.* is sufficiently near the former in sense, as applied to a tree. So *εὔσκιος* occurs as rendering of 'ר in xi. 16.

21. ξ *i.* זֶרַע אֱמֶת. *ἀληθινήν.* A free rendering.

(*om. a.*) לִי. O' *vacat.*

γ. סוּרֵי. *εἰς πικρίαν.* The somewhat obscure substantival use of the pass. ptcp. puzzled O', while the simple participial use of the same word in (ק') xvii. 13 gave them no trouble. Hence they chose here to read either (*a*) לְמְרוֹרָה, or לְמְרוֹרֹת, a word which they have also rendered by *πικρία* in Deut. xxxii. 32, or less probably (*b*) לְמוֹר, *myrrh*, which is found once in the Pent. (Ex. xxx. 23), but is not either there or elsewhere rendered by them *πικρία.*

22. ξ *i.* נִכְתָּם עֲוֹנֵךְ. *κεκηλίδωσαι ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου.* A free translation.

(*om. a.*) נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי יְהוִֹה. *λέγει* Κύριος; A adds *ὁ θεός σου.* The hard and fast tradition perpetuated by the M.T. as to the pointing of the Sacred Name when in juxtaposition with אֲדֹנָי is clearly later than the time of O'. We find, corresponding to this combination in M.T., the following renderings:

(*a*) Κύριος (*Κύριε* or *Κύριέ μου*), here and in vii. 20, xlix. 5 [xxx. 5], l. [xxvii.] 31; so Jos. vii. 7; 2 S. vii. 19 [1°], 20; Is. xlix. 22; Ps. lxviii. [lxix.] 21;

(*b*) *κύριος* Κύριος (*κύριε* Κύριε or *κύριέ μου*, Κύριε) e.g. Jud. vi. 22; 2 S. vii. 19 [2°]; 1 K. viii. 53; Is. xxviii. 16, xxx. 15, lii. 4; Am. v. 3; Ps. cix. [cviii.] 21, cxl. [cxxxix.] 8, cxli. [cxl.] 8;

(*c*) K. *ὁ θεός* (K. *ὁ θ. σου*), e.g. ii. 19; Deut. iii. 24; Am. iii. 11; Hab. iii. 19;

(*d*) *δέσποτα* Κύριε, e.g. i. 6, iv. 10;

(*e*) more loosely, O′'s Heb. text probably differing; e.g. Κύριε *βασιλεῦ τῶν θεῶν*, Deut. ix. 26.

It is of course possible that in such cases as (*a*) one of the words in M.T. may have been afterwards added.

23. *ξ i bis.* אַחֲרֵי הַבְּעָלִים. *καὶ ὀπίσω τῆς* Βάαλ. A loose translation.

*η* or *ξ i.* דַּרְכֵּךְ. *τὰς ὁδούς σου.*

*v.* בַּגַּיְא. *ἐν τῷ πολυανδρίῳ.* Suidas, *Lex.*, s.v. has *π.* = *μνῆμα, τάφος, ξενοτάφιον.* SH. here translates similarly, giving however Aq., Symm. as *ἐν ταῖς φάραγξι* (these may have rendered by *ἐν τῇ φάραγγι.* See Field *ad loc.*). The primary meaning of the Heb. word was necessarily well known to O′ (comp. vii. 31 f. etc.), but as the valley of Hinnom[1] and its connexion with sepulture would be unfamiliar to the ordinary Gentile reader, this was interpreted for his benefit. On the contrary in vii. 32 (where see also note), owing to the fulness of the Heb., an interpretation was not so much

[1] גַּיְא, not עֵמֶק, or נַחַל, was the name specially given to that one among the valleys in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem. See *Quart. Statement* of Pal. Explor. Fund, Jan. 1889, pp. 38 ff.

needed. But although not there given, it appears (and so for תֹּפֶת, διάπτωσις) in the parallel passage, xix. 6.

*a d.* דְּעִי. *καὶ γνῶθι*, freely.

δ. בִּכְרָה. *ὀψέ*. The Heb. word (occurring here only) puzzled O′, who translated as though it were בָּעֶרֶב. The conjecture of Michaelis (*Obs. Phil. et Crit. in Jer. etc.*, ed. J. F. Schleusner, Gött. 1793) that they read the Heb. as a verb בִּכְּרָה (comp. Arabic root), would surely rather require *πρωΐ*.

ε. קַלָּה. *φωνὴ αὐτῆς* (קֹלָהּ). For this with the previous word Aq. Symm. Theod. have *δρομὰς κούφη*.

γ or δ. מְשָׂרֶכֶת דְּרָכֶיהָ. *ὠλόλυξεν*. (24) *τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς*. The root 'שׂ is *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*. Hence O′ may have treated it as = שׁרק, which occurs xix. 8, xlix. 17 [xxix. 18], l. [xxvii.] 13 (Lam. ii. 15, 16). In all these places however that root is uniformly rendered by *συρίζω*. Therefore there is much to be said for Döderlein's view (*Repert. Bibl. et Orient. Lit.* i. 233), that *ὠλ.* is the rendering of a variant on 'ב' ק, viz. בכה בְקֹלָהּ, where 'ב is probably intended for the fem. ptcp. בֹּכָה (I should suggest, with less change, בכתה קלה i.e. בָּכְתָה קֹלָהּ), while 'מ was passed over as inexplicable. Aq. Symm. (see Field's note) have *συμπλέκουσα ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς*.

24. γ. פֶּרֶא. *ἐπλάτυνεν*. O′ read as from

the root פרץ, thus rendered Gen. xxviii. 14, or possibly פתה, which πλ. represents in Gen. ix. 27; Deut. xi. 16; Prov. xx. 12, xxiv. 28.

γ. לְמַד. ἐφ' ὕδατα, reading לְמֵי or עַל־מֵי. We may note that these two changes were consequent upon their commencing the sentence with דְּרָכֶיהָ, which itself followed naturally upon their failure to understand מִשׁ'.

γ. שָׁאֲפָה רוּחַ. ἐπνευματοφορεῖτο. O' saw here the root סחף (so Wo.), which occurs in Niph. in xlvi. [xxvi.] 15. It may well have been the fault of their MS. Nevertheless שאף is a word which has shewn itself to be unfamiliar to O' in other places, e.g. Ps. lvi. [lv.] 2, 3, lvii. [lvi.] 4, although the translator of xiv. 6, שָׁאֲפוּ רוּחַ, εἵλκυσαν ἄνεμον (so Aq. here εἵλκυεν ἄνεμον), dealt with it successfully. It does not occur in the Pentateuch.

δ. תַּאֲנָתָהּ. παρεδόθη. Clearly (against Wo.) they connected with the root אנה, known to them through Ex. xxi. 13, where it is rendered by the same verb.

ξ i. בְּחָדְשָׁהּ. ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτῆς (and so Theod.). O' either intend their rendering to be a euphemism for *in menstruis eius*, or, perplexed by the expression "in her month," connect with the root דוש, *conterere*, which appears in Hoph. Is. xxviii. 27. Aq. has ἐν νεομηνίᾳ αὐτῆς. 'Ο Ἑβραῖος has ἐν τῷ ἀροτριᾶν (בַּחֲרִשָׁהּ).

25. *ξ i.* מִיַּחַף. *ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ τραχείας*, freely. Aq. Symm. (*ἀπὸ*) *ἀνυποδεσίας*.

*ε.* וַתֹּאמְרִי. *ἡ δὲ εἶπεν.* Probably the י had been lost or obliterated. Then, as consequential changes, the subsequent first persons were rendered as thirds.

*δ* and *ξ e.* נוֹאָשׁ. Ἀνδριοῦμαι, while לֹא is omitted (see on *v.* 31), or לִי read instead of it. O′ connect the word both here and in xviii. 12 with אִישׁ. It is somewhat rare and does not occur in the Pentateuch. St Jer., seeking apparently to give some sense to O″s rendering, expands to "In malo proposito agam viriliter," but in Vulg. has "superavi."

26. הֹבִישׁוּ. *αἰσχυνθήσονται.* Aq. has *ᾔσχυναν* (or *κατῄσχυναν*). But it is only in 2 S. xix. 6 that this verb is transitive in Hiph. See Jer. vi. 15, viii. 12, xlvi. 24, xlviii. 1 (*bis*), 20, l. 2 (*bis*). Spohn's conjecture (*in loco*) that O′ must have read בּוֹשׁוּ would suggest that he also had failed to realise this fact.

*ξ i.* בֵּית. *οἱ υἱοί.* Wo.'s בְּנֵי is a fair example of his many needless changes.

27. *η.* אֹמְרִים לָעֵץ. *τῷ ξύλῳ εἶπαν.* אָמְרוּ might easily be got from 'אמרי.

*ε.* יְלִדְתָּנוּ ק׳. Σὺ *ἐγέννησάς με* (יְלִדְתָּנִי כ׳). The plural is more likely in this case to have been

changed to the sing. (for the sake of harmonizing) than the converse. Consequently O′ and the 'כ probably represent an early corruption, which never became universal.

*η*. פָּנִים. *πρόσωπα αὐτῶν*, easily got from 'פני.

28. *ξ i*. יָקוּמוּ אִם־יוֹשִׁיעוּךָ. *εἰ ἀναστήσονται καὶ σώσουσιν* (אAQ add *σε*), freely.

*a a*. יְהוּדָה. O′ adds *καὶ κατ' ἀριθμὸν...Βάαλ*. The form of the clause is clearly suggested by the Heb. of xi. 13.

29. *λ*. תָּרִיבוּ. *λαλεῖτε*. O′ shrank from what might savour of impiety. Hence we need not consider (with Wo.) that they had not our text before them. Aq. Symm. *δικάζεσθε*.

*a c*. כֻּלְּכֶם פְּשַׁעְתֶּם. *πάντες ὑμεῖς ἠσεβήσατε καὶ πάντες ὑμεῖς ἠνομήσατε* (but A om. *ἠσεβ*....*ὑμεῖς*) and so SH. A double rendering. 'פ is translated by *ἀσεβεῖν* in *v*. 8, iii. 13, and elsewhere, and by *ἀνομεῖν* in Is. xliii. 27; comp. Job xxxv. 6. St Jer. testifies to the present text of O′.

30. *ξ a*. לָקָחוּ. *ἐδέξασθε*. O′ changed the person for the sake of parallelism with *ἐφοβήθητε* in the next clause.

*ξ b*. חַרְבְּכֶם. *μάχαιρα*. Aq. Symm. *μάχαιρα ὑμῶν*. O′ suits the parallelism. The pron. suffix is evidently a slip, caused by the ending of the next word.

31 [Gk 30]. γ and ξ *e*. הַדּוֹר אַתֶּם. καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθητε. O′ saw in these words the root ירא, finding also, or supplying from the parallel clause, a negative; for which characteristic of O′ see further *infra*.

ξ *i*. רְאוּ. ἀκούσατε, freely.

*a b*. יְהוָֹה. O′ adds τάδε λέγει Κύριος.

δ. מַאְפֵּלְיָה. κεχερσωμένη. Aq. has ὀψίγονος, Symm. ὄψιμος, both connecting the Heb. (as Field points out) with אָפִיל, for which O′ has ὄψιμος in Ex. ix. 32. 'מ is ἅπαξ λεγόμενον and evidently not familiar to O′, who rendered by a guess.

ξ *e* and δ. רַדְנוּ. οὐ κυριευθησόμεθα (A δουλευθησόμεθα). Aq. has ἀπέστημεν, Symm. ἀνεχωρήσαμεν. O′ seems to have taken the verb (a rare one) as though from רדה, but in a passive sense which occurs in v. 31 (see that passage), and to have conjectured that לֹא had been accidentally omitted or that it was to be understood from the following clause. Comp. note on הַדּוֹר אַתֶּם above, and in general, for the freedom with which O′ deals with small and frequently used words and specially לֹא, see Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, p. 26. See also note on v. 2, and comp. other instances within these chapters in *v*. 25, v. 3 (here also see note), 10, ix. 4 [5]. We might of course explain οὐ κυρ. as a roundabout way of expressing the active sense of רדה, but then probably it would have been rendered without such circumlocution.

32. *β a.* הֲתִשְׁכַּח בְּתוּלָה עֶדְיָהּ כַּלָּה וגו׳. *μὴ ἐπιλήσεται νύμφη τὸν κόσμον αὐτῆς καὶ παρθένος κ.τ.λ.* The renderings of ב׳ and כ׳ are transposed. Both words are of frequent occurrence elsewhere in Jer. May they not here have been changed for the sake of alliteration (putting the *a* and *u* sounds together), on the principle illustrated by Wellh. (*Der Text d. B. Sam.*) p. 10? See other examples in note on *v.* 19.

33. *ξ c.* לָכֵן. *οὐχ οὕτως*; probably an error of ear in dictation. Comp. 1 Sam. iii. 14 [13].

*ζ* and *γ.* אֶת־הָרָעוֹת לִמַּדְתְּ ק׳. *σὺ ἐπονηρεύσω τοῦ μιᾶναι*, reading אַתָּה רָעוֹת לְטַמֵּא. O′ apparently supports כ׳ (לִמַּדְתִּי archaic for the ק׳), for the י is needed to complete the suggestion of the א to their eyes, and their rendering very possibly presents the original text.

34. *γ.* בִּכְנָפַיִךְ. *ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου.* Aq. Symm. (*καὶ ἐν τοῖς πτερυγίοις σου*) agree with M.T., which is also the better reading in itself.

*om. a.* אֶבְיוֹנִים. O′ *vacat.* The Heb. may well be a gloss on the following words. Aq. Symm. Theod. have *πενήτων*. So Vulg. *pauperum*.

*ε.* אֵלֶּה. *δρυί*, reading אֵלָה, but this is no improvement upon the obscurity of the Heb.

36. (*θ.*) תֵּזְלִי. *κατεφρόνησας*, viewing the

word as Hiph. of זול or זלל, which voice appears also in Lam. i. 8. I have placed this in the class where one root has been mistaken for another of kindred form. But why should not O′ be so far right that 'ת may be the Kal fut. (תָּזֹלִּי) of one of those roots? We should thus (*a*) avoid the Aramaic dropping of the א, so rare in Heb., (*b*) obtain a root whose meaning is at least as apposite as that of אזל, (*c*) fully justify the use of מְאֹד, which, as M.T. stands, hardly accords with the sense of אזל.

37 [Gk 36]. *η.* לָהֶם. *ἐν αὐτῇ* (לה read as though לָהּ).

iii. 1. *om. d.* לֵאמֹר. O′ *vacat.* The construction in the Heb. is somewhat harsh. 'לא is probably to be connected with מאם of the previous verse.

*a d.* הֲיָשׁוּב אֵלֶיהָ. *μὴ ἀνακάμπτουσα ἀνακάμψει πρὸς αὐτόν;* Did O′ (or their Heb. original) read השוב (= הֲשׁוּב), as finding (in marg. or text) a gloss תשוב (= תָּשׁוּב), with or without a consequential gloss אליו, and as considering 'ת to be part of the original text, and אֵלָיו to be a correction? Against this conjecture on the other hand is to be reckoned the fact that in no less than six other cases (xxii. 24, xxxi. [xxxviii.] 33, 39, xxxii. [xxxix.]

28, xxxiv. [xli.] 2, li. [xxviii.] 57) O′ presents us with a similar Hebraism, *unrepresented in M.T.* It may be said that this would scarcely be done by Greek-speaking Jews. *Idioms* however have a remarkable tenacity of life, as compared with the *words* of a language. See p. 6.

*ν.* הָאָרֶץ. ἡ γυνή. Midrashic. O′ failed to recognise here an instance of the prophet's frequent intermingling of the image and the thing signified. SH. in its text follows the Heb.

*ε.* רֵעִים. ἐν ποιμέσιν (רֹעִים).

*ξ i.* וְשׁוֹב. καὶ ἀνέκαμπτες, apparently (rightly) taking Heb. as infin. abs. (not as Targ. Pesh. St Jer. as imperative), but giving it the meaning of a past tense. Better, *And thinkest thou to return?* literally, *And is it* (a matter of) *returning?*

2. *κ.* שְׁפָיִם. εὐθεῖαν. Comp. Numb. xxiii. 3, where εὐθεῖαν stands for שֶׁפִי (שְׁפִי). The word seems to have had difficulties for O′. In xii. 12 they render by διεκβολή, in xiv. 6, νάπαι, in iii. 21 and vii. 29, χείλη, but probably in these two cases reading שְׂפָתָם. In iv. 11 they omit the word. They seem to have taken the notion of εὐθεῖαν from the Aramaic sense of שפא (שפה), *trivit, fricuit.* Comp. even in Heb. הַר־נִשְׁפֶּה (Is. xiii. 2), *mons lævis, abrasus, nudus arboribus.* So εὐθὺς occurs in connexion with the clearing of a passage, Is. xl. 3, 4.

*β b.* Obs. BאA have *εἰς εὐθ. τ. ὀφθ. σου* (A adding *λέγει κύριος*). Q has *τ. ὀφθ. σου εἰς εὐθ.*

*δ.* כַּעֲרָבִי. *ὡσεὶ κορώνη* (כְּעֹרֵב). עֹרֵב would be a fairly familiar word, as occurring three times in the Pentateuch, while עֲרָבִי (עַרְבִי) does not appear outside the less well-known Is. Neh. Chr.

וַתַּחֲנִיפִי. *καὶ ἐμίανας.* Symm.'s rendering, *καὶ ἔνοχον ἐποίησας*, is strange, and suggests the root חיב. In Mic. iv. 11 he also translates in like manner תֶּחֱנָף by *κατακριθήσεται* (*καταδικασθήσεται*).

3. *γ.* וַיִּמָּנְעוּ רְבִבִים וּמַלְקוֹשׁ לוֹא הָיָה. *καὶ ἔσχες ποιμένας πολλοὺς εἰς πρόσκομμα σεαυτῇ.* מל' seems to have been read either מִכְשׁוֹל (yet for this *πρ.* is an unlikely rendering, inasmuch as in vi. 21 מכ' is translated *ἀσθενίαν*, and כשל is frequently translated by *ἀσθενέω*) or מוֹקֵשׁ (so Wo.); comp. Exod. xxiii. 33, xxxiv. 12; the whole clause being thus read וְרֹעִים רַבִּים לְמוֹקֵשׁ לָךְ הָיוּ.

*ξ i.* וּמֵצַח. *ὄψις*, freely.

(*γ.*) In the last clause of this verse *πρὸς πάντας* perhaps arose from a marginal gloss intended by a Heb. scribe as a correction of, or variant for, הִכָּלֵם, which with the preceding word may have been read by O′ (so Wo.) מֵאֵין תִּכָּלְמִי. It is true, as

Dr Driver points out (*Expositor*, 3rd Ser. vol. ix. 1889, p. 325), that such Hebrew will not construe, but it does not seem certain that O′ would have perceived this.

4. *γ*. מֵעַתָּה. *ὡς οἶκον.* MS. 88 (which is closely allied to SH.) has *οἰκεῖον*, but this does not agree with SH. itself, which moreover in marg. preserves the Heb. reading. O′ perhaps read מְעֹנָה (so Wo. with J. D. Michaelis, *Obs. Phil. et Crit. in Jer. etc.* ed. J. F. Schleusner, Göttingen, 1793), for מְעוֹנוֹת is rendered *κατοικητήριον* in xxi. 13. It seems however quite as likely that they here read בֵּיתָה (so Scholz, p. 90). Perhaps O″s Heb. MS. was here difficult to decipher. The latter part of the verse they translate loosely, as though they read נְעָרַיִךְ.

5. *ε*. יִשְׁמֹר. *φυλαχθήσεται* (אA *διαφ.*), reading יִשָּׁמֵר.

*κ*. לָנֶצַח. *εἰς νῖκος*, from the Aramaic and Syriac sense of the root. Contrast *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* in l. [xxvii.] 39; also their rendering of Niph. ptcp. in viii. 5.

*ξ ι*. הָרָעוֹת. *τὰ πονηρὰ ταῦτα*, not quite literally.

6. *θ ter*. מְשֻׁבָה. *ἡ κατοικία*, apparently taking it to be = מוֹשָׁב, and so in *vv.* 8, 12, omitting the word in *v.* 11. Elsewhere (ii. 19, iii. 22, v. 6,

viii. 5, xiv. 7; Hos. xi. 7; Prov. i. 32) מְשׁוּבָה (בוֹת–) is an abstract noun. Read therefore (with Michaelis) מֻשְׁבָּה (Hoph. ptcp. of שׁבה). The root שׁוב, occurring twice (תָּשׁוּב, שָׁבָה) in *v.* 7, and again (שׁוּבָה) in *v.* 12, may have helped towards the Mass. reading of the word. Perhaps we should also read הָלְכָה.

*ξ i.* רַעֲנָן. *ἀλσώδους.* See on ii. 20. Aq. renders, more freely than is his wont, *εὐθαλοῦς.*

*η.* וַתִּזְנִי. *καὶ ἐπόρνευσαν* (A*vid -*σεν*), apparently reading ותזני as a contraction for וַתִּזְנֶינָה. The תְּמַחִי however of xviii. 23 for תְּמַחֶה (2 p. m.) suggests that both that case and this are Aramaic forms. Comp. הֶחֱלִי in Is. liii. 10.

*7. ξ i.* עֲשׂתָה. *πορνεῦσαι αὐτήν.* The construction of the following simple accus. (*ταῦτα πάντα*) with this verb is harsh, and it is probably a corruption of *ποιῆσαι*, which has arisen from the preceding *ἐπόρνευσαν.*

*η.* תָּשׁוּב. *ἀνάστρεψον* (תָּשׁוּבִי).

*om. c* and *a a.* בָּגוֹדָה אֲחוֹתָהּ יְהוּדָה. *τὴν ἀσυνθεσίαν αὐτῆς ἡ ἀσύνθετος Ἰουδά.* בָּגוֹדָה, though confined to this passage, is probably an actual word, and the true reading in *vv.* 7, 10. Otherwise there would have been no reason for

not conforming to the בֹּגֵדָה of *v.* 8. Was O′'s reading בגודה יהודה, with (marg.) gloss בגדה, suggested by the בגדה of *v.* 8, but regarded by O′ as an accidentally omitted part of the text, and read by them בִּגְדָה, as opposed to the pointing transmitted by M.T.? בֶּגֶד, *perfidia*, occurs in xii. 1 (ἀθετήματα). At any rate אֲחוֹתָהּ would hardly have been omitted (and so in *vv.* 8, 10), if O′ had had it before them. It may therefore be taken as a subsequent amplification, suggested by Ezek. xxiii. 11 (*bis*), doubtless a very familiar passage to the earlier post-exilic Jews. The other Greek versions have ἡ ἀσυνθ. ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτῆς.

8. וָאֵרֶא. καὶ εἶδον. If we are to accept Prof. Cheyne's proposal (so as to harmonize with the latter part of the verse) to read here (with Ezek. xxiii. 11) וַתֵּרֶא (so here Kenn. 137, and Pesh.), the corruption of the Heb. text will have been early enough to be adopted by O′.

*a d.* περὶ πάντων ὧν καὶ εἶδον, περὶ πάντων ὧν κατ. So B*. But B^ab^ℵAQ *om.* ὧν 1°...πάντων 2°.

*om. d.* אֹדוֹת. O′ *vacat.*

*γ.* נִאֲפָה. κατελήμφθη, not reading נִתְפְּשָׂה (as Wo.; comp. 2 Chr. xxv. 23; Ps. lxxi. [lxx.] 11), but נִשְּׂאָה. Comp. x. 19, where נשא is so rendered.

*a a.* אֵלֶיהָ. O′ adds εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, evidently a gloss, taken from Deut. xxiv. 1, 3.

*om. c.* אֲחוֹתָהּ. O′ *vacat.* See on *v.* 7.

9. *θ.* מִקֹּל. *εἰς οὐθέν*, connecting the word somehow (מַקַּל, suggested by Mich., is otherwise unknown) with קלל. Targ. Pesh. Vulg. interpret מ as the preposition, and connect with the same root. So A.V. and R.V. "through the lightness." Ges. however (see *Thes.* s. v.), in spite of this consensus, inclines to קוֹל, *voice.*

*om. a.* וַתֶּחֱנַף אֶת־הָאָרֶץ. O′ *vacat.*

*β b.* אֶת־הָאֶבֶן וְאֶת־הָעֵץ. *τὸ ξύλον καὶ τὸν λίθον.*

10. *om. c.* אֲחוֹתָהּ. O′ *vacat.* See on *v.* 7.

*om. a.* נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה. O′ *vacat.* The Heb. insertion was either for a euphemistic reason (so as not to end the paragraph with שָׁקֶר), or merely as amplifying or explanatory. MSS. 26, 36, and others (and so SH.) and Aq. Symm. Theod. have the words.

11. *om. a.* מְשֻׁבָה. O′ *vacat,* doubtless rightly.

12. *a b.* שֻׁבָה. O′ adds *πρὸς μέ.*

*ξ i.* לוֹא־אַפִּיל. *οὐ στηριῶ*, freely. Comp. Vulg. *avertam.*

*a b.* אֶטּוֹר. *μηνιῶ.* O′ adds *ὑμῖν.*

13. *ξ i.* שְׁמַעְתֶּם. *ὑπήκουσας* (A *ἤκουσας*). O′ need not have read שָׁמַעַתְּ (as Wo. makes them do). Targ. and Pesh. favour M.T., and such a change of number is itself far from alien to the

genius of Heb. (e.g. *vv.* 18, 'כ 19 (*bis*); Numb. xiii. 22, xxxiii. 7; 1 S. ix. 4), and here would also quite fall in with J.'s tendency to mingle the image and the thing signified. (See on iii. 1.)

14. שׁוֹבָבִים. *ἀφεστηκότες.* Contrast *v.* 22, *ἐπιστρέφοντες.*

*ξ i.* אָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי. *ἐγὼ* (A pref. *ἰδοὺ*) *κατακυριεύσω.* Besides the strangeness of the tense here, we may contrast the verb used in xxxi. 13, *ἠμέλησα.* Yet the Heb. verb must have the same meaning in both places, and in favour of the sense *husband* is not only the context here, but the usage of the word elsewhere in O. T. Aq. Symm. have *ἔσχον ὑμᾶς.* Vulg. *vir vester.*

15. *γ.* דֵּעָה. *ποιμαίνοντες* (A *ποίμαινες sic*), reading רֹעִים.

*γ.* וְהַשְׂכֵּיל. *μετ' ἐπιστήμης*, as if through confusion between the sounds of ב and ו. For a similar interchange, comp. x. 3.

16. (*ξ d.*) בְּרִית יְהוָֹה. *διαθήκης Ἁγίου Ἰσραήλ.* Probably not a recensional variation. It was known to SH. (marg.), which however agrees with M.T. It may have been suggested by some liturgical form.

*ε* and *ξ i.* וְלֹא יִזְכְּרוּ־בוֹ. *οὐκ* (A *καὶ οὐκ*) *ὀνομασθήσεται* (יִזָּכֵר). MS. 88 adds with asterisk *ἐν αὐτῇ.* (So SH.)

ε. יִפָּקֵדוּ. ἐπισκεφθήσεται (יִפָּקֵד).

ε. יֵעָשֶׂה. ποιηθήσεται. This last (inconsistently omitted by Wo.) was very naturally, and perhaps rightly, read by O′ יֵעָשֶׂה, and thereby determined the treatment of the two previous verbs.

17. *a a.* בָּעֵת הַהִיא. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ, agreeing with the Heb. of l. [xxvii.] 4, 20, and the earlier part suggested also by the preceding and following verses.

*om. a.* לְשֵׁם יְהוָֹה לִירוּשָׁלָ͏ִם. O′ *vacat.* Probably a Heb. gloss, suggested by xxiii. 6, if with Prof. Cheyne (*Pulpit Comm.*) we read there 'ירו (to which א still testifies) for יִשְׂרָאֵל.

δ. שְׁרִרוּת. ἐνθυμημάτων (A ἐπιθ.). The study of this word in its eight occurrences in M.T. of J., together with its varying representation in O′, in itself amounts to a disproof of Wo.'s theory[1]. In xi. 8, xiii. 10 O′ does not render in any way. It is possible, though unlikely, that to these vii. 24 should be added. (See note there.) In ix. 13 [14], xvi. 12, xviii. 12 O′ has τὰ ἀρεστά, in xxiii. 17 πλανῇ. Wo. accordingly 'retranslates' the Greek in each passage into the ordinary Heb. equivalents. But thus according to his principles the pre-Septuagintal text (to quote Prof. H. P. Smith) "did not contain the word at all, but always had some other word in its place," an hypothesis, which, utterly improbable in

[1] See Dr Driver in *Expositor*, l.c. p. 328, and Prof. H. P. Smith in *Journal of Bibl. Lit.* l.c. p. 112.

itself, is rendered still more hopeless, as Dr Driver points out, by "the fact, that in the two other places where the word occurs in the Old Testament, Deuteronomy 29, 18 [19], Ps. 81 [80], 13, it is represented in LXX. by *ἀποπλάνησις* (as by *πλανή* in Jeremiah 23, 17) and *ἐπιτηδεύματα*." Doubtless the word was strange to O′, and consequently they were in each case guided by the context.

We may note that words ending in ־וּת ־ִית, while somewhat rare in other Bibl. Heb., are favourites with J., and are very frequent in Aramaic. Comp. כְּרִיתוּת, מַלְכוּת (three times) for מַמְלָכָה, גֵּרוּת (for מָלוֹן), חָנוּת. For other examples see Knobel, *Jer. Chaldaizans*, Breslau, 1831.

18. λ. צָפוֹן. O′ adds *καὶ* (A om. *καὶ*) *ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν χωρῶν*. The tendency to supplement or expand existing, though to a less extent, in O′, may here be explained as connected with a natural desire to include Jews living in Egypt.

*ξ a.* אֶת־אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם. *τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν*. O′'s alteration is for the sake of smoothness. Heb. idiom however (see on *v.* 13) is very tolerant of such changes of person.

19. *η.* אָמַרְתִּי. O′ adds Γένοιτο, Κύριε, which is their rendering in xi. 5 of אָמֵן יְהוָֹה, and is introduced here, as following upon the translators' assumption that אָנֹכִי refers to the prophet, an assumption not altogether unnatural, when we consider that

the pronoun is emphatic, as though to indicate a change of speaker. Aq. Symm. and SH. are against the words, which O′ (see Wo. p. 192, who refers to Movers and Hitzig) probably got out of the איך (אָמֵן יְהוָה כִּי) which follows. See on ii. 2, 3.

*ν.* צְבִי. *θεοῦ.* Midrashic. Misled by the following צְבָאֹת (which they render *Παντοκρά-τορος*) they did not perceive that צְבִי is descriptive of the inheritance, not of its Divine Owner. The rendering of the other Gk. Verss. here is uncertain.

*ε.* תִּקְרְאִי ק׳, תָּשׁוּבִי ק׳. *καλέσατε, ἀποστρα-φήσεσθε* (אQ *ἀποστραφήσῃ*), following כ׳ (תִּקְרְאוּ, תָּשׁוּבוּ). So Pesh. But SH. and Vulg. agree with ק׳.

20. *γ.* מֵרֵעָהּ. *εἰς τὸν συνόντα αὐτῇ.* The Heb. is suspicious, as the only case where בגד is constructed with מִן. מ and ב were similar in ancient writing. See Wo., p. 273.

*ξ ι.* בְּגַדְתֶּם. *ἠθέτησεν* (א *-σαν*), a loose translation, by no means warranting us in assuming, with Wo., a different text.

21. *δ.* שְׁפָיִים. *χειλέων*, reading שְׂפָתַיִם, as that word is thus rendered in Ezek. xxiv. 17. See further above on *v.* 2.

*ξ ι.* תַּחֲנוּנֵי. *καὶ δεήσεως*, loosely.

*γ.* יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם. *θεοῦ Ἁγίου αὐτῶν*, appa-

rently reading for the first word (perhaps owing to illegibility of MS.) קֹדֶשׁ. I cannot construe Wo.'s conjecture אלהי קָדְשָׁם.

22. שׁוֹבָבִים. ἐπιστρέφοντες. See on *v.* 14.

ξ *i.* אֶרְפָּה. καὶ (probably not recensional, and perhaps introduced by a copyist) ἰάσομαι. We find above 30 MSS. with ארפא (see Kenn.). Comp. Prov. xviii. 9, מִתְרַפֶּה, ὁ μὴ ἰώμενος (obs. also the inserted negative; for which see on ii. 31). Inasmuch as רָפָה is a neuter verb in Ḳal, we cannot (with Mich.) translate ארפה by *remittam*, and the Mass. punctuation (as a ל״ה verb) also involves a borrowing of meaning from רפא, as in xix. 11, li. 9, and so in other Books. So we may comp. the subst. מַרְפֵּה in viii. 15 (in these the Heb. note suggests א as the more correct spelling), and פָּרָה in ii. 24 (so best editions) as against פְּרָאִים in xiv. 6. Observe that, although רפה (in Hiph.) may appear the more suitable of the two roots to be connected with such a word as מְשׁוּבָה, yet in Hos. xiv. 5 רפא (with no variant) is joined with the same word.

γ. מְשׁוּבֹתֵיכֶם. τὰ συντρίμματα ὑμῶν (A αὐτούς). Συντ. is used in vi. 14 to render שֶׁבֶר (and so συντριμμός in iv. 20 and συντριβή in iv. 6); but the Heb. tempts the conjecture that O′ read

מְשְׁבָּרֶיךָ, a word used of waves, either literally (Jon. ii. 4) or as a figure for calamity (Ps. lxxxviii. 8; 2 S. xxii. 5, where the parallel in Ps. xviii. 5 has חֶבְלֵי). I cannot find that משברות (suggested also by Mich.) "is a word in actual use" (H. P. Smith, l. c. p. 115).

*a b* and *ε*. הִנְנוּ אֹתָנוּ לָךְ. *ἰδοὺ δοῦλοι* (Q *οἴδε*) *ἡμεῖς* (A *ὑμ.*) *ἐσόμεθά σοι.* O′ seems to have inserted δ. (omitted however by many MSS. and by SH.) as epexegetical. To suppose, with Wo., that they had a different text, is wholly unnecessary. We may decline Prof. H. P. Smith's conjecture (l. c. p. 117) אֲנַחְנוּ for אֹתָנוּ, if we point אֹתָנוּ, a use of אֵת which can hardly be called impossible in itself, in the face of such a passage as Hag. ii. 17 *s. fin.*, and which, even had it no Bibl. support, would probably have presented, as far as classical Heb. is concerned, small difficulty to the translators.

23. *ξ i.* מִגְּבָעוֹת הָמוֹן הָרִים. *οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ ἡ δύναμις τῶν ὀρέων*, loosely.

N.B. This verse furnishes a good example of O′'s readiness to render the same Heb. word, occurring twice (אָכֵן), by different words, *ὄντως* and *πλήν*.

24. מִנְּעוּרֵינוּ. *ἀπὸ νεότητος ἡμῶν.* ℵAQ have *αὐτῶν* and so SH.; Pesh. Vulg. as M.T., which is clearly right.

25. *om. a.* לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. *ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.*

iv. 1. *ξ i, quinquies.* Probably O′ found the Heb. somewhat illegible. At any rate they made a wrong choice here and at the beginning of *v.* 2, in the person of the five verbs (תָּשׁוּב *bis*, תָּסִיר, נִשְׁבַּעְתָּ, תָּנוּד), the first four of which however are in themselves ambiguous in this respect, and they failed to recognise the clue afforded by the suffix in שִׁקּוּצֶיךָ.

*om.* (*a*). וְאִם. *ἐάν.*

*a c.* מִפָּנַי. *ἐκ* (Q *ἀπὸ τοῦ*) *στόματος αὐτοῦ* (A om. *ἐκ στ. αὐ.*) *καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ* (א*A om. *τοῦ*) *προσώπου* (אQ add *μου*; A adds *αὐτοῦ*). O′′s rendering is conflate, as including the corruption מִפִּיו. For loss of נ comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 12 (קוֹלֵךְ, *φωνήν σου*) and so שת for שנת on the Moabite stone.

*γ* and *ξ e.* וְלֹא תָנוּד. *εὐλαβηθῇ* (תָּגוּר). For O′′s freedom in dealing with לא etc. see on ii. 31.

2. *a b.* O′′s addition (at the end), *τῷ θεῷ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*, found also (but ܥܒܪܝܐ has an asterisk) in SH., is apparently Midrashic.

3. *ξ a.* וְלִירוּשָׁלַםִ. *καὶ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἱερ.* (A om.), assimilating to the language of many other passages, viz. *v.* 4, xi. 2, 9, xvii. 20, xviii. 11, xxv. 2, xxxv. [xlii.] 17, xxxvi. [xliii.] 31.

We may note that in these wherever the word

אִישׁ occurs (viz. here and in the following *v.*; so xi. 2, 9, xviii. 11) Wo. considers O′ to have read אַנְשֵׁי, although no Heb. sing. has a more undoubted claim to a collective sense, when the context so requires. (See Deut. xxvii. 14; Jos. ix. 6, x. 24; Jud. ix. 55, xv. 10, xx. 33, 36, 42; 1 S. xiv. 22; 2 S. xv. 13; 1 K. viii. 2 etc.) See H. P. Smith, l. c. p. 113, on this *v.*, and p. 111, on ii. 6.

4. *a d* and *γ*. לַיהוָה. *τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν.* Symm. has *τῷ κυρίῳ*, Vulg. *Domino.*

*ξ i.* וְהָסִרוּ. *καὶ περιτέμεσθε*, but א*A *περιέλεσθε* (A -*θαι*). The latter rendering was probably suggested by its occurrence in *v.* 1.

*ε.* חֲמָתִי. *ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ* (AQ *μου*), as though the words of the prophet. This is not noticed by Wo.

5. *om.* (*a*). וְאִמְרוּ. *εἴπατε* (אA pref. *καὶ*).

*ξ i.* מַלְאוּ. *μέγα*, freely.

הַמִּבְצָר. *τὰς τειχήρεις*, and so SH. A has *τ. ὀχυράς*, adopted from viii. 14. *Τειχ.* occurs here only in J., while *πόλεις ὀχ.* is a frequent expression in J. and elsewhere.

6. *ε.* נֻסוּ. *φεύγετε* (נֻסוּ or נֻס). See *v.* 21.

הָעִיזוּ. See on vi. 1.

7. *γ.* מִסֻּבְּכוֹ. *ἐκ* (אAQ *τῆς*) *μάνδρας αὐτοῦ*, possibly reading מִסֻּכּוֹ. Comp. Ps. x. 9 [ix. 30].

*om. d.* וּמַשְׁחִית. *ἐξολεθρεύων*, an easy con-

fusion of eye, owing to the ending of the previous word.

*ξ i.* אַרְצֵךְ. *τὴν γῆν.* See following note.

*ξ i.* עָרַיִךְ. *καὶ πόλεις* (Q *αἱ π. σου*). Wo. (as H. P. Smith, l. c. p. 110, points out) in making O′ read וְהֶעָרִים, has failed to note that BאA *all* have *καὶ πόλεις* (without the article). Probably O′ read it as עָרִים, and then made their rendering of the preceding אַרְצֵךְ to conform to it.

*θ.* תִּצֶּינָה. *καθαιρεθήσονται.* The rendering is defensible, with the Heb. as it stands. Comp. the sense of נצה (but in Niph.) in 2 K. xix. 25; Is. xxxvii. 26. If however we are to look on O′ as translating a variant, H. P. Smith (l. c. p. 109) is doubtless right in thinking that as *καθαιρέω* is used[1] as the rendering of נתץ, it is probable that their copy had a word derived from that root. He does not however explain how the word תתצינה, which he assigns to them as on the whole their probable reading, can possibly be formed from those root-letters.

8. *ξ i.* עַל־זֹאת. *ἐπὶ τούτοις*, freely.

(*om. a.*) חֲרוֹן אַף. *ὁ θυμός* (Q adds *ὀργῆς*). In the face of Is. xiii. 13 we cannot feel at all sure that O′'s Heb. text was not the same as ours. MSS.

[1] Not however, as he says, "twice" but once (lii. 14) in J.

23, 26, (so SH.,) Compl. Ald. have ὁ θ. ὀργῆς. Ὀργὴ θυμοῦ (obs. the order) is the rendering of ח׳ א׳ in *v.* 26.

(*ξ a.*) מִמֶּנּוּ. ἀφ' ὑμῶν (א* ἡμ.). An easy and frequent corruption of ἡμῶν, even if the reading be not original, and a free rendering by way of conforming to the earlier part of the *v.* Pesh. Vulg. agree with M.T.

10. אֲהָהּ. Ὦ. See on i. 6.

*ξ i.* אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה. δέσποτα Κύριε. See on ii. 22.

*om. a.* יִהְיֶה לָכֶם. ἔσται (AQ add ὑμῖν). O′ would hardly have disregarded the second word.

*a d.* וְנָגְעָה. καὶ ἰδοὺ (א*AQ *om.* ἰδ.) ἥψατο (Q ἅψεται).

*ξ i.* הַנָּפֶשׁ. τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν, freely.

11. *ϵ.* יֵאָמֵר. ἐροῦσιν, freely.

*ξ i.* צַח. πλανήσεως. None of the conjectures are quite satisfactory. Probably the word was more or less illegible. Aq. (πνεῦμα) λαμπήδονος, Symm. (πν.) καύσωνος. St Jer. (*ventus*) *urens sive roris* (read *erroris*).

*om. d.* שְׁפָיִם בַּמִּדְבָּר. ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, thus omitting to render ׳שׁ. See on iii. 2.

12. *om. a.* מֵאֵלֶּה. O′ *vacat.* The Heb., however we may explain it, is awkward. Perhaps it represents a post-Septuagintal error, מאל not

S. 5

properly erased, but accompanied by the marginal correction מלא. Either the subsequent copyist who inserted the latter in the text, or another one added the ה to מאל, so as to obtain a word of familiar appearance. Aq. Symm. Theod. have *ἀπὸ τούτων*, while MSS. 22, 36, and others have these words without, and 88 (so SH.) with, an asterisk.

מִשְׁפָּטִים. *κρίματα* BאA (Q adds *μου*). Wo. (מִשְׁפָּטַי) is therefore on his own principles wrong in making O″s Heb. MS. differ here from M.T.

13. *ξ i.* כַּעֲנָנִים. *ὡς νεφέλη*, freely.

*ξ i.* שֻׁדָּדְנוּ. *ταλαιπωροῦμεν*. A free translation, but supported by several other instances in this Book alone (*v.* 20 *bis*, ix. 18 [19], x. 20, xii. 12). So שֹׁד is rendered by *ταλαιπωρία* in *v.* 20 (where see note), vi. 7, xx. 8, and שֹׁדֵד in vi. 26, xv. 8, li. [xxviii.] 56.

14. *ξ i.* תָּלִין. *ὑπάρχουσιν* (AQ *ὑπάρξ.*), freely.

15. *a b.* מִדָּן. *ἐκ Δὰν ἥξει*. Midrashic. MS. 88 has *ἥξ. ἐκ Δ.* SH. relegates the verb to its marg. Vulg. om.

*ξ i.* וּמַשְׁמִיעַ. *καὶ ἀκουσθήσεται*, freely.

16. (*a b.*) הִנֵּה. *ἰδοὺ ἥκασιν*. This may be Midrashic, and part of O″s genuine text, but rather

its origin would seem to be as a variant for the *ἔρχονται* of the later part of the *v.*

*θ.* נְצָרִים. *Συστροφαί, bands, troops.* O′ connected with root צרר, which they translate by this substantive in Hos. iv. 19, xiii. 12; and by the corresponding verb in Ezek. xiii. 20; Prov. xxx. 4 [xxiv. 27].

17. *η.* מָרָתָה. *ἠμέλησας.* O′, as Wo. points out, has the support of the Targ. (סָרֵיבְתְּ). But Aq. and the other Greek translators have 3rd pl., and so SH. If we assume the word to have been originally written מרת, it could be read (comp. *v.* 19) either as 2nd p. s. f. (מָרְתְ) or 3 p. s. f. (in sense of 3rd p. pl.). Comp. הָגְלָת, xiii. 19; עָשָׂת, Lev. xxv. 21, הִרְצָת, Lev. xxvi. 34 (so והית as כ׳ in 2 K. ix. 37). Among those who adopted the latter reading the ה final would naturally soon be added.

19. *om. a.* מֵעַי 2°. O′ *vacat* (AQ *τὴν κοιλίαν μου*).

*θ.* אוֹחִילָה ק׳. *ἀλγῶ.* The אוחולה כ׳, seems, as Ges. says, to have arisen from a confusion of ק׳ and of אחולה (אָחוּלָה) which some MSS. (Kenn. gives 19) exhibit. There is no parallel for this sense of יחל. On the other hand נַחְלָה (fem. ptcp. Niph. of חלה) is twice in this Book (x. 18 [19], xxx. [xxxvii.] 12) rendered *ἀλγηρά.* It is therefore most probable that O′ here saw that root.

*a c.* הוֹמֶה־לִּי לִבִּי. *μαιμάσσει ἡ ψυχή μου, σπαράσσεται ἡ καρδία μου* (א* *om.* the whole). A conflate rendering.

*ε.* שָׁמַעַתְּ ק׳, שמעתי כ׳. *ἤκουσεν.* As soon as the י of the old form of the 2nd s. f. was gone, as appears to have been the case in O′'s original, שמעת could be read as either person. Comp. *v.* 17.

20. *γ.* שֶׁבֶר 1°. *ταλαιπωρίαν* (Q -*ίας*), reading שֹׁד. See on *v.* 13. שֶׁבֶר 2° is rendered *συντριμμόν.* See on iii. 22. In Is. lx. 18 שֹׁד and שֶׁבֶר are rendered (in reversed order) by *σύντριμμα* and *ταλ.*

*ξ i bis.* שֻׁדְּדָה (שֻׁדְּדוּ). *τεταλαιπώρηκεν bis.* See on *v.* 13.

*ξ i.* אֹהָלָי. *ἡ σκηνή* (A *σκηναί*), freely.

*γ.* רֶגַע. *διεσπάσθησαν.* רגע is (*a*) *to frighten* (Is. li. 15) or (*b*) *to shrink, to be quiet through terror* (Job vii. 5). I can find no authority for the assertion of Schleusner (notes on Michaelis, *in loco*) that רגע can mean *discindere.* O′ clearly read the root letters of קרע.

21. *ε.* נֵס. *φεύγοντας.* Comp. *v.* 6.

*ξ i.* אֶשְׁמְעָה. *ἀκούων*, a corruption of *ἀκούω* (so Q*), which is itself a loose rendering. SH. has fut., and so Vulg. *audiam.*

22. *θ.* אֱוִיל. *οἱ ἡγούμενοι* (and so SH.),

explained by *ἰσχυρούς*, which is their rendering of אוּלֵי (אֵילֵי ק׳), *strong ones* (i.e. *chief men*) in 2 K. xxiv. 15, a passage naturally very familiar to Jews of the Dispersion.

23. *ξ i.* תֹּהוּ. *οὐθέν*, similarly rendered 1 S. xii. 21 (*bis*); Is. xl. 17, 23; Job xxvi. 7.

*om. a.* וָבֹהוּ. O′ *vacat.* The word is rendered *ἀκατασκεύαστος* in Gen. i. 2, and occurs elsewhere only in Is. xxxiv. 11, where also O′ omits. This is very suspicious, as the word must have been quite familiar to them.

24. *ξ i.* הִתְקַלְקָלוּ. *ταρασσομένους.* As H. P. Smith (l. c. p. 113) points out (against Wo.'s desire to give O′ a different original), the root is similarly rendered in Eccl. x. 10.

25. נָדָדוּ. *ἐπτοεῖτο*; but Aq. *μετηναστεύθησαν.*

26. *ξ i.* עָרָיו. *αἱ πόλεις.* O′ disregarded the pronoun, as inconsistent with their view of the meaning of כַּרְמֶל. See on ii. 7.

*β b.* נִתְּצוּ. See on ii. 15.

*a d.* אַפּוֹ. O′ adds *ἠφανίσθησαν*, which may well be a marg. correction of *ἐμπεπυρ*.

28. *β b.* זַמֹּתִי וְלֹא נִחַמְתִּי. *καὶ οὐ μετανοήσω, ὥρμησα.* O′'s order is certainly a more natural one.

29. *ξ i.* וְרֹמֵה. *καὶ ἐντεταμένου.* רמה is translated by the same verb in Hos. vii. 16.

*γ.* כָּל־הָעִיר 1°. *πᾶσα* (Q ins. *ἡ*) *χώρα*, probably reading כָּל־אֶרֶץ. The Targum (כָּל־יָתְבֵי־אַרְעָא), "all the inhabitants of the country," points to this reading.

*γ.* כָּל־הָעִיר 2°. *πᾶσα πόλις.*

These two together form a somewhat perplexing problem. At any rate the article, originally it would appear absent on both occasions, might easily creep in, with עִיר from the readiness with which the word would be supposed to refer to Jerusalem alone, with אֶרֶץ to increase the dramatic effect, assisted also by parallelism, and by the occurrence of this word in *vv.* 23, 27. While we thus obtain הָעִיר 2°, and (for אֶרֶץ the original reading for הָעִיר 1°,) הָאָרֶץ, the latter word, if written 'הַאר, might easily, by confusion of eye with the next line, be copied as הָעִיר.

*a c.* בָּאוּ בֶּעָבִים. *εἰσέδυσαν εἰς τὰ σπήλαια, καὶ εἰς τὰ ἄλση ἐκρύβησαν.* The former clause of these may possibly represent a variant בַּחֹרִים, of which however there is no trace otherwise. עָבִים on the other hand, as bearing an unusual sense, can scarcely fail to be the original reading of the Heb., and may, as Schleusner (*in loco*) suggests,

have been correctly rendered ἄλση, *thickly wooded hills*, which by a would be corrector, connecting it with an Arabic root, *to be concealed*, was altered to σπήλαια, thus giving rise to the present conflate rendering.

30. *om. a.* שָׁדוּד is suspicious, as being anomalous in gender, and not represented in O′, although well known to them. See on *v.* 13. MSS. 23, 36, and others have ἡ ταλαίπωρος; Aq. Symm. ταλ., unless (see Field's note) Aq. had προνενομευμένη, "vastata," which St Jer. attributes to him.

*ν.* תִּקְרְעִי. ἐγχρίσῃ. Midrashic.

*ξ i.* תְּתַיַּפִּי. ὁ ὡραισμός σου, freely.

יְבַקֵּשׁוּ. ζητοῦσιν. So B, but אAQ have the harder and more accurate ζητήσουσιν.

31. *ξ i.* צָרָה. τοῦ στεναγμοῦ σου, freely.

*ξ i.* תִּתְיַפֵּחַ. ἐκλυθήσεται. The Heb. root is probably connected with נפח, פוח. O′ translated freely.

(*β a.*) תְּפָרֵשׂ. παρήσει. Is this word (employed here only to render the Heb. root) an illustration of O′'s occasional tendency to use for translation a word of similar sound? See on ii. 19.

ε. לְהֹרְגִים. ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνῃρημένοις, reading לַהֲרֻגִים.

v. 1. *om. d.* אִם־יֵשׁ אִישׁ. εἰ ἔστιν. M.T. is probably a kind of conflation, being a combination

of the contracted (א׳ יש׳) and full form of the second and third words (so Movers, mentioned by Wo.). Scholz's interpolation of מצא is violent.

ξ *i* or *η*. לָהּ. *αὐτοῖς* (Q* *αὐτῇ*). This may well be considered as a rendering *κατὰ σύνεσιν*, although it may have been read as לה׳ = לָהֶם.

2. *γ*. וְאִם. *λέγει Κύριος*, reading נְאֻם, supplying its usual subject, and joining the expression to the previous words.

ξ *e*. יִשָּׁבֵעוּ. *οὐκ...ὀμνύουσι*. For the introduction of the negative see on ii. 31. Here it may possibly have arisen out of the ל of לָכֵן. In this and many other cases, by making the sentence interrogative, we may of course restore the sense to that of M.T.

3. ξ *e*. הֲלוֹא לֶאֱמוּנָה. *εἰς πίστιν*, a case of the converse kind to the preceding.

4. *δ*. נוֹאֲלוּ. *διότι οὐκ ἐδυνάσθησαν* (א *ἠδυν.*, AQ *ἠδυνήθ.*) In l. [xxvii.] 36 *παραλυθήσονται*. The Heb. verb is somewhat rare, and therefore loosely translated.

ξ *a*. אֱלֹהֵיהֶם. *θεοῦ*, freely. The pron. is omitted for the sake of parallelism.

5. נִתְּקוּ. *διέρρηξαν*. The Heb. root was rendered in ii. 20 by *διασπάω*.

6. *γ* and *ζ*. עֲרָבוֹת. *ἕως τῶν οἰκιῶν*, reading (not

עַד בַּיִת, with Wo. and so Driver, *Samuel, Introd.* p. xxxi, but) עַד בָּתַּי׳. This accounts both for O''s plural, and (by thus transferring the ׳ from the verb which follows) for their rendering by a past tense (ὠλόθρευσε). The only approaches to a parallel in the Heb. are in זְאֵבֵי עֶרֶב in Hab. i. 8 and Zeph. iii. 3. In the latter passage O′ renders ע׳ τῆς Ἀραβίας. Prof. Cheyne (*Pulpit Comm. in loco*) points out that we have no reason to suppose that עֶרֶב makes pl. עֲרָבוֹת. Understand therefore *of the deserts* (pl. of עֲרָבָה).

*ε.* שֹׁקֵד. ἐγρηγόρησεν, reading שָׁקַד.

7. וָאַשְׂבִּעַ. *καὶ ἐχόρτασα.* Other MSS. have שׁ, thus giving the meaning, *I caused them to swear.*

*γ.* יִתְגּוֹדָדוּ. *κατέλυον* (A -*οντο*), reading Hithp. of גור (and so SH.). It may be noted that the root גרר, *to drag, seize*, supplies the only similar verbal form in J. (xxx. 23), viz. מִתְגּוֹרֵר.

8. *θ.* מְיוּזָנִים ק׳. *θηλυμανεῖς*, evidently connecting this difficult word with זנה.

*om. d.* מַשְׁכִּים is unrepresented in O′. All proposed ways of construing it are beset with difficulties, and early tradition varies. Aq. Theod. have *ἕλκοντες* (מֹשְׁכִים), and so St Jer.; Symm. *ἑλκόμενοι* (מֻשְׁכִים) and so MS. 88 and SH. It looks like an early (marg.) conjecture for indistinct letters in the text.

10. בְּשָׁרוֹתֶיהָ. ἐπὶ τοὺς προμαχῶνας αὐτῆς. The word was unfamiliar to O′, who however have dealt with it with fair success.

γ *bis*. הָסִירוּ וגו׳. O′ appear to have been quite baffled by the latter part of this verse. For הָסִירוּ they seem to have read (ὑπολίπεσθε; AQ -λείπ-) הַשְׁאִירוּ, and for נְטִישׁוֹתֶיהָ (τὰ ὑποστηρίγματα αὐτῆς) either לְמִשְׁעֲנֶיהָ, or, less probably, לְאֻשְׁיוֹתֶיהָ. The latter substantive, it is true, occurs (ק׳) l. [xxvii.] 15 (O′ there rendering ἐπάλξεις), but the former presents on the whole an easier misreading of the Heb. consonants, if somewhat indistinctly written. In either case the נ seems to have been read as ל (נט׳ is doubtless *vine-tendrils*, as in xlviii. 32; Is. xviii. 5).

ξ *e*. לוֹא. O′ *vacat*. See on ii. 31.

11. β *b*. נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה. B has λέγει Κύριος earlier in the verse; ℵAQ omit. The words therefore were probably altogether absent from the original text, though found in Aq. Symm. Theod., and with an asterisk in MS. 88, SH.

12. ξ *f*. לוֹא־הוּא. Οὐκ ἔστιν ταῦτα. The natural meaning of the passage is, *It is not really God who speaks*. O′'s desire appears to have been to get as far as possible from the irreverent sense which the words might conceivably bear, viz. *He* (*God*) *is not*.

13. *ξ i.* וְהַדִּבֵּר. *καὶ λόγος Κυρίου.* A free translation, which assumes the Heb. to be a substantive, which however is not found elsewhere (except *possibly* Hos. i. 2). To make the word to be a Pi'el ptcp. with מ omitted is of course possible, though the only undoubted instance of such omission (in Pi'el), except where מ is also the root letter of the verb, is that in Eccl. iv. 2 (שַׁבֵּחַ).

λ. כֹּה יֵעָשֶׂה לָהֶם. BאQ have *οὕτως ἔσται αὐτοῖς*, but A omits. It is very possible that O' or a copyist may have omitted the words, as thinking it to be too much to the national discredit that the formula of cursing should have been used towards the prophets. SH. inserts them without an asterisk.

14. *om. a.* אֱלֹהָי. O' *vacat.* *ὁ θεός* is inserted with asterisk by MS. 88 (so SH.).

*e.* נֹתֵן. *δέδωκα* (נָתַן).

15. *om. d.* In the earlier part of this verse the omission of all from the second to the fourth גּוֹי is a familiar kind of error which may well have been committed by transcribers, or, conceivably, by the translators themselves. Aq. Theod. and so MS. 88, SH., support M.T.

*ξ* (*d*). The latter part of the verse, if it be indeed meant to represent the present Heb. text, is a very free translation, closely conforming however to the Heb. of Deut. xxviii. 49, a passage which may have been specially familiar to the

Egyptian Jews for liturgical reasons. But when we notice that the first three words of *v.* 16 are also absent from O′ (supplied with an asterisk in MS. 88, SH.), it looks as though their MS. was defective or illegible here. Possibly the omitted words may represent an accidentally dropped line of the original.

17. *a a.* וּתְאֵנָתֶךָ. O′ adds (but א* *om.*) *καὶ τοὺς ἐλαιῶνας ὑμῶν.* The passage Ps. iv. 8, which Wo. (p. 75) adduces in defence of O′ here, seems rather to weaken, than to support, his case. Not only is it unlikely that the words, if representing a Heb. original, would *in both places* have dropped out of the text used by O′ between the time of that version and that of the M.T., but also, by disregarding them, the triple parallelism, so carefully maintained up to this point throughout the verse, is continued till the ear shall be satisfied by the comparatively long final clause. The addition would have been easily suggested to O′ or a transcriber by any of the passages Ex. xxiii. 11; Deut. vi. 11; Jos. xxiv. 13; 1 Sam. viii. 14. SH., evidently by accident, marks the words as though ὑμῶν alone were unrepresented in the Heb.

γ. יְרֹשֵׁשׁ. ἀλοήσουσιν (Q -σωσ-), reading doubtless ד for ר, inasmuch as this verb is used more frequently than any other to translate דוש (including subst. דַּיִשׁ), viz. in Deut. xxv. 4; Jud. viii. 7 (in B); Is. xli. 15; Mic. iv. 13; 1 Chr. xxi. 20.

18. *a d.* יְהוָה. Κύριος ὁ θεός σου.

19. *om. c.* עֲזַבְתֶּם אוֹתִי וְ. O′ *vacat.* ἐγκατελίπετέ με (καὶ) is found however in Q XII, 22, 33, 36, and others (so SH.) and appears in Compl. Ald. The Heb. may have been suggested by such passages as xxii. 9; Jud. x. 10, 13.

20. בִּיהוּדָה. ἐν τῷ Ἰούδᾳ. οἴκῳ appearing in Q marg. is omitted in BאA. Wo. not only ignores this fact in his Conspectus, but also adduces this (p. 78) as one of the three passages which he cites to shew "superior parallelism due to the additions in the Septuagint."

*om. a.* לֵאמֹר. O′ *vacat.*

24. *η* and *γ.* בְּעִתּוֹ שְׁבֻעוֹת חֻקּוֹת. κατὰ καιρὸν πληρώσεως προστάγματος (בעתו׳ שבעת ח׳). The rendering of the first word suggests that contractions were familiar to the translators. For the next word, while they clearly read the initial letter as שׂ, the probability is that they understood it as the construct (whether sing. or pl.) of שָׂבְעָה, occurring in three other places (Is. xxiii. 18, lvi. 11; Ezek. xxxix. 19) as against Wo.'s שִׂבְעָה, which is otherwise ἅπαξ λεγόμενον (Ezek. xvi. 49). Theod. and Aq. (but apparently in his 2nd ed., see Field's note) read as שׁ, and so SH. (ܕܡܘܡܬܐ).

O′ may have chosen שׂ, as finding some difficulty in recognising the 'coordinated' or 'suspended'

const. state in שׁ׳ ח׳ קָצִיר, *weeks of—appointed ones of—harvest.* Other instances of this construction are found in xiv. 17, xlvi. 11; Gen. xiv. 10; Deut. xxxiii. 19; Jud. xix. 22; 1 S. xxviii. 7; 2 S. xx. 19; 2 K. x. 6, xvii. 13 ק׳, xix. 21; Is. xxiii. 12, xxxvii. 22, xlvii. 1; Job xx. 17; Lam. i. 15, ii. 13.

26. *om. d.* יָשׁוּר כְּשַׁךְ. O′ *vacat.* Aq. Symm. according to St Jer., connected י׳ with יָשָׁר, *upright,* but made it a proper name "*Iasir, quasi rete aucupis*; quod etiam qui bonus inter eos videtur et rectus, instar aucupis tendat insidias." Although this is far from satisfactory, it is not easy to make anything better out of the present text. We may observe that O″s rendering of the rest of the *v.* is opposed to the accentuation of M.T.

27. *a b.* כִּכְלוּב. ὡς παγὶς ἐφεσταμένη (א with its tendency to 'improve' has συνεσταμένη). ἐφ. is Midrashic. παγίς is meant doubtless (not so Wo.) as a translation of כ׳, of which, as a rare word (elsewhere only in Am. viii. 1, 2) they inferred the meaning, and perhaps quite correctly, from the context. Prof. Cheyne (*Pulpit Comm. ad loc.*) says, "Hitzig seems right in inferring that the 'cage' was at the same time a trap (comp. Ecclus. xi. 30, 'Like as a partridge *taken in a cage* [ἐν καρτάλλῳ, a peculiar kind of basket], so is the heart of the proud ')." For the word καρτ. see vi. 9.

28. *om.* (*d bis* and *a bis*). שָׁמְנוּ עָשְׁתוּ, דִּבְרֵי־רָע,

וַיַּצְלִיחוּ. O′ *vacat.* It would seem that the marked divergence of the Heb. and Gk texts here is due to a combination of very various causes. Of the first two Heb. words 'ע is so rare (only Hithp. Jon. i. 6, and there in quite a different sense) that, even if it was plainly written, it may well have suggested no meaning whatever to the translators. The same can scarcely be said of 'שׁ, as that verb at any rate occurs twice in Deut. xxxii. 15 (not elsewhere in the Pent.), a verse however where there is also a good deal of deviation between the two texts. On the whole in the case before us we may incline to suppose that it was indistinctly written. It is difficult to understand any reason for the omission of the remaining words, if they formed part of the text. On the other hand their presence dislocates the balance, and spoils the parallelism in both parts of the verse, while there is by no means a consensus as to either the meaning of the somewhat strange collocation of words עָבְרוּ ד' ר', or the pointing of the middle one, Symm. Theod. reading דְּבָרַי, and explaining *παρέβησαν τοὺς λόγους μου εἰς πονηρόν.* So St Jer. *Praeterierunt sermones meos pessime.* Can these, together with 'ויצ, be an early gloss (or two separate glosses) "words of (concerning) a wicked man," "and they (*enallage*) prosper"?

*ξ a* or *i.* אֶבְיוֹנִים. *χήρας.* אֶבְיוֹן on its first occurrence in this Book (ii. 34) has no Greek

counterpart (see note there); in the two remaining cases (xx. 13, xxii. 16) O′ has found no difficulty, rendering each time by *πένης*. The rendering here is therefore probably a free one suggested by the preceding יָתוֹם, with which אַלְמָנָה is so frequently coupled, specially in Deut.; and the variant may have been suggested by Is. i. 23.

31. *ξ* (*c*). יִרְדּוּ עַל־יְדֵיהֶם. *ἐπεκρότησαν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν.* The *ο* of the verb (א* *ἐπεκρώτησαν*) is evidently a slip for *α*. (It is worth noting that the converse mistake occurs in Tischf.'s Roman text of O′ in Am. vi. 5, where the reading of the Sixtine ed., 1587, and of B itself is *ἐπικροτοῦντες*). In Aq. (*ἐπεκρότουν ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν*) the same error appears. So Vulg. *applaudebant*, and SH. Symm. has a different verb (*συνεπίσχυσαν αὐτοῖς*). Theod.'s rendering (*συνῄνουν αὐτοῖς*) is specially interesting, both as shewing that the error, which it thus implies and expresses by a synonym, was as old as his day, and as illustrating the character of his translation as a revision of O′ rather than an independent work. Wo. actually maintains the correctness of *ἐπεκρότ.*, making O′ to have read יְמַחֲאוּ, and relegating יִרְדּוּ to a parenthesis.

*ξ i.* None of the Gk versions except Aq. (*ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν*) seem to have got hold of the exact sense of the Heb. expression עַל־ידי', viz. *under the direction*, *leadership*. For examples see

Ezra iii. 10; 1 Chr. xxv. 3; 2 Chr. xxiii. 18. The other Gk renderings refer these words to the priests instead of the prophets, and indeed it would seem likely that it was in such a view that the change of *a* to *o* (see preceding note) originated.

vi. 1. *θ*. הָעִזוּ. Ἐνισχύσατε, taking the root to be עזז, *to strengthen*, which however, on the two other occasions on which it is found in Hiph. (Prov. vii. 13, xxi. 29), denotes shamelessness or obstinacy. On the other hand עוז, *to take refuge* (Is. xxx. 2), gives us here (and elsewhere, iv. 6[1]; Ex. ix. 19; Is. x. 31) the sense of gathering (possessions etc.) into a place of safety or for flight, and thus harmonizes with the words that follow. Aq., less literal than usual, has ὁρμηθῆτε.

מִקֶּרֶב. Vulg. (and so SH. marg.) has *in medio*. The origin of the inaccuracy may well be the fact that in the passage iv. 6 (referred to in the last note) "the fenced cities," including Jerusalem, were to be the places of refuge. Here on the contrary they were to flee from Jerusalem southwards.

2 [Gk 1]. *γ*. הַנָּוָה. γίνεται. O′ read נִהְיָה, joining it with the preceding verse. Wo. apparently considers (contrary to his general principles) that the γίνεται had no corresponding Heb. in O′'s text,

[1] תַּעֲלִי in xi. 15 was evidently read in O′ (διαφεύξῃ) תָּעוּזִי from עוז, not, as Wo., תַּחֲלְצִי.

and that נִהְיָה was the original of their *ἀφαιρεθή-σεται.*

*γ bis.* וְהַמְּעֻנָּגָה דָּמִיתִי. *καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται τὸ ὕψος σου.* ענג must have been a sufficiently familiar root to O′, as it occurs Deut. xxviii. 54, 56 (*bis*). Hence we must suppose that their MS. was indistinct, or that the present Heb. text is corrupt. The conjectural emendation which involves least change is that of Schleusner (*Nov. Thes. in LXX. etc.*, Glasgow, 1822, s.v. *ἀφαιρέω*), וְהַמְּנֻעָה. In the second word O′, taking ד for ר, probably read רָמָתֵךְ.

3. *δ.* אֶת־יָדוֹ. *τῇ χειρὶ* (א *τὴν χεῖρα*) *αὐτοῦ* (A *αὐτῶν*). In almost all the places where יָד means *locus*, Numb. ii. 17 (in Deut. xxiii. 13 O′ *vacat*); Jos. viii. 20; Is. lvii. 8; Ezek. xxi. 24 [20] O′ have failed to understand it. Is. lvi. 5 is about the only exception.

4. *ξ i.* קַדְּשׁוּ. *παρασκευάσασθε*, freely.

יִנָּטוּ. *ἐκλείπουσιν*, apparently an error for an original *ἐκκλίνουσιν.* Comp. the use of *ἐκκλ.* as the rendering of the same verb in xiv. 8. The Gk verbs becoming identical in the two clauses, this would help towards the other slip of still further assimilating this clause to its predecessor by ending it with *τῆς ἡμέρας* (so Bא) instead of *τῆς ἑσπέρας.* The latter reading is still preserved in AQ, 23, 33,

and others, while 86, 88 (so SH.) have τ. ἑσπ. in text and τ. ἡμ. in margin.

ξ *a*. עֶרֶב. τῆς ἡμέρας. See preceding note.

5. δ. אַרְמְנוֹתֶיהָ. τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς, loosely. The Heb. word does not occur in the Pentateuch, and but twice (1 K. xvi. 18; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 19) in the historical Books. It receives very varied treatment at the hands of O′, viz. ἄμφοδα (so in xvii. 27, xlix. 27 [xxx. 16], where comp. the inconsistent treatment of the two in Wo.'s *Conspectus*), ἄντρον, βάρις, βασίλειον, γῆ (see on ix. 20), θεμέλιον, ναός, οἶκοι, πόλις, πυργόβαρις, χώρα. Three only of these (βάρις, βασίλειον, πυργόβαρις) can on Wo.'s principles be taken as a rendering of 'ארמ, while for the remaining eight, according to him, different words must be assumed as found by O′ in their Heb. original. Looking therefore at these eight (which represent six separate Books and twenty-four passages), we see that an examination of O′'s treatment of the passages where 'ארמ occurs in M.T. supplies an argument against Wo. of the same nature, and at least as decisive, as that furnished us by the case of שְׁרִרוּת (see on iii. 17). It is true that the word θεμέλιοι (θεμέλια) is used in several cases to render יְסוֹד[1] or מוֹסָדוֹת, one or other of which words Wo. considers to have stood

[1] Read in Hatch and Redpath's list of cases (and so in both Trommius and Kircher) Ps. 136 (137). 10 (not 7); ἕως ὁ θεμέλιος ἐν αὐτῇ.

in O′′s Heb. text here. But this of itself proves nothing. In nine passages besides the present (seven of them occurring in Am. i. ii.) *θεμ.* corresponds to ארמ׳. In all four occurrences in this Book Aq. Symm. render by *βάρις*.

6. *om. a.* יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. Κύριος. (Q adds *τῶν δυνάμεων*.)

ε. כִּרְתוּ. Ἔκκοψον (Q -*ψατε*), suggesting that in O′′s copy it was written without the *mater lectionis*.

ε. עֵצָה. *τὰ ξύλα* (Q *θεμέλια*) *αὐτῆς*, reading the word as though it were the עֵצָהּ of Deut. xx. 19.

*ξ i.* וְשִׁפְכוּ. *ἔκχεον*, probably recensional. At any rate there is no apparent reason why O′ should have omitted the conjunction.

δ. סֹלְלָה. *δύναμιν.* O′ seem to have been quite at sea as to the exact meaning of this word. In xxxii. [xxxix.] 24 they render by *ὄχλος*, and in xxxiii. [xl.] 4 by *χάρακες*.

γ. הָפְקַד. *ψευδής*. A case where a comparison of the other Gk versions yields interest. The construction in M.T. is far from smooth, and very possibly corrupt. It may have been for this reason that O′ was induced to read the word as הַשֶּׁקֶר. Whether this variant actually existed in their time or not, Aq. seems to have found it.

He has ἄδικος, a frequent rendering of שֶׁקֶר by O′ themselves in J. and elsewhere. Symm. on the other hand (τῇ πόλει τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς) testifies to our present M.T. in some shape.

7. כְּהָקִיר בַּיִר (בּוֹר כ׳) מֵימֶיהָ. ὡς ψύχει λάκκος ὕδωρ (Q adds αὐτοῦ). The Heb. root is either (*a*) קוּר, found but twice elsewhere (2 K. xix. 24; Is. xxxvii. 25, both times in Ḳal and in the sense of *digging for water*), or (*b*) קרר, a root found in cognate languages only, *to keep cool*. The latter sense is followed not only by O′ but by Symm. and St Jer., who also tells us that "pro *lacu*...in Hebraico BOR dicitur," thus giving no indication of the existence of the Ḳ'ri. The latter (which occurs nowhere else) may be intended to mean בְּאֵר, *a well*, *fountain*, and to indicate that the Mass. adopted the Rabbinic view; viz. that which makes the root קוּר to have the sense of *pouring forth*, this interpretation certainly making the point of the comparison plainer.

η. פָּנַי ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς, apparently read as פני׳=פָּנֶיהָ. MSS. 22, 36, and others, as well as Aq., have μου. SH. and St Jer. on the other hand follow O′.

8. ξ i. תִּוָּסְרִי. ἀποστῇ, a free rendering (so also in Ezek. xxiii. 17) of a word, which must have been known to O′, as occurring in Gen. xxxii. 26 [25, ἐνάρκησεν].

9. *om. a.* צְבָאוֹת. O′ *vacat* (Q τῶν δυν.). See on ii. 22.

γ. עוֹלֵל יְעוֹלְלוּ. Καλαμᾶσθε, καλαμᾶσθε (עוֹלְלוּ עוֹלְלוּ). Comp. for this verb as rendering 'ע Jud. xx. 45.

ξ *i.* הָשֵׁב יָדְךָ. ἐπιστρέψατε.

סַלְסִלּוֹת. κάρταλλον. O′ may be right in identifying the Heb. word (which is ἅπαξ λεγ.) in sense with סַלִּים of Gen. xl. 16, but it seems at least as likely that it is another form of זַלְזַלִּים, *vine-tendrils* (Is. xviii. 5).

11. η. חֲמַת יְהוָֹה. τὸν θυμόν μου. See on ii. 2, 3.

ξ *i.* נִלְאֵיתִי הָכִיל. καὶ ἐπέσχον καὶ οὐ συνετέλεσα αὐτούς, a very loose translation of M.T. 'Επ. has the same sense as in Gen. viii. 10 etc. (so Acts xix. 22).

ξ *i.* שְׁפֹךְ. ἐκχεῶ. The Heb. imperative is harsh. Our R.V. however has gone back to it.

*om. a.* וְעַל. ἐπί 2°.

בַּחוּרִים. νεανίσκων. The fact that Aq. Theod. seem (see Field's note) to have had πονηρευομένων (עֲרוּמִים?) would point to an early corruption, and possibly the original expression is lost.

12. (*η*.) וְנָשִׁים. *καὶ αἱ* (א *om. αἱ*) *γυναῖκες αὐτῶν*. Wo.'s וּנְשֵׁיהֶם (וּנְשׁוֹתֵיהֶם is an obvious slip) is quite uncalled for.

13. *ξ i.* בֹּצֵעַ בָּצַע. *συνετελέσαντο* (AQ *-σαν*) *ἄνομα* (Q *τὰ ἄν*.). A close parallel for this free rendering is found in Prov. i. 19 (כָּל־בֹּצֵעַ בָּצַע. *πάντων τῶν συντελούντων τὰ ἄνομα*). Comp. Is. xxxiii. 15 (*ἀνομία*).

*om. a bis* and *β b* and *a b.* וּמִנָּבִיא וְעַד כֹּהֵן. *ἀπὸ ἱερέως* (AQ ins. *καὶ*) *ἕως ψευδοπροφήτου*. If this were the only case to be dealt with, we should be tempted to decide in favour of O′'s order (SH. however agrees with M.T.), arguing thus. If M.T. had been the original form, we can see no reason why the translators should have objected to the priest being (as is implied by the parallelism of the verse) a more important person than the prophet, and so should have transposed these substantives. On the other hand, when the memory of the prophets had faded into the past, and priestly control over records had become paramount, the change from the Heb. text suggested by O′ to the present one would be very conceivable. It may be objected that in three other passages, viz. xiv. 18, xxiii. 11, 33 (in 34 the variation of order does not occur) the same phenomenon presents itself, while this reasoning does not apply. The framers of M.T. however

may well have made their treatment of this passage their guide on the subsequent occasions. Ψευδο(πρ.) is Midrashic; so on eight other occasions in this Book, once only (Zech. xiii. 2) elsewhere.

14. (בַּת) O′ *vacat.* Symm. has *τῆς θυγατρός*, but the best Heb. Editions omit[1]. The word is obviously an insertion from the parallel passage, viii. 11 (where O′ *vacat*).

עַל־נְקַלָּה. *ἐξουθενοῦντες, making light of* [*it*], an excellent rendering. From Aq.'s *ἐπ' ἀτιμίᾳ* (especially if compared with Symm.'s *μετ' εὐκολίας*), it may be conjectured that here, as well as elsewhere (see on vii. 3, viii. 5), his knowledge of Heb., combined with extreme literalness, was overborne by a desire to differ from O′, which, as the standard Version of Greek-speaking Christians, could not fail to be viewed with prejudice by a follower of R. Akiba.

*γ.* אַיִן. *ποῦ.* Not a free translation, nor yet, as suggested by Spohn[1], a sign that they read וְאֵיךְ, but the rendering of אָן, to which Ποῦ corresponds in 1 S. x. 14 (so to אָנָא in Jer. xv. 2).

15. *ξ i.* תּוֹעֵבָה. *ἐξελίποσαν.* Probably meant

[1] Over 20 MSS. are cited by Kenn. as omitting, and many are added by de Rossi.

[2] *Jer. Vates e Vers. Alexandrinorum etc.* Leipzig, 1794 and 1824, i. 101.

as a loose rendering of the Heb., *failing* to heal a wound, this being a continuation of the metaphor of the preceding verse. 'ת at any rate was a word with which O′ had no difficulty in dealing on its seven other occurrences in this Book.

*η*. הַכְּלִים. *τὴν ἀτιμίαν αὐτῶν*, reading 'הכלמ as הַכְּלִמָּה, which is thus rendered by O′ in iii. 25, xx. 11, li. [xxviii.] 51.

*ϵ*. בַּנֹּפְלִים. *ἐν τῇ πτώσει αὐτῶν* (בְּנָפְלָם). Comp. נָפְלָם, *πτώσεως αὐτῶν* in xlix. 21 [xxix. 22].

*ξ i*. פְּקַדְתִּים. *ἐπισκοπῆς*, a free rendering, unless we take the reading of AQ, *ἐπ. αὐτῶν* (פְּקֻדָּתָם), and so explain on the analogy of the two previous cases. The *αὐτῶν* however may better be considered as inserted from the parallel passage x. 15.

*ξ i*. יִכָּשְׁלוּ. *ἀπολοῦνται*. *ἀσθενέω* is the verb used in *v*. 21 and five other places in J. as renderings of 'כ. This therefore seems to point to some early Heb. variant, which may be connected with the *ἀπολοῦνται* occurring in *v*. 21.

16. *a b bis* and *ν*. Not only are O′'s insertions of *Κυρίου* and *καὶ ἴδετε* Midrashic, but their translation of מַרְגּוֹעַ by *ἁγνισμὸν* (A *ἁγιασμὸν*) is of the same character. The kindred מַרְגֵּעָה of Is. xxviii. 12 is there rendered by them *ἀνάπαυμα*;

here the nature of that *rest* is explained as *divine* rest, sanctity. That even the translators of a Book so badly rendered as Isaiah should have recognised the usual sense of the root רגע is so far against Schleusner's conjecture (notes on Michaelis *in loco*) that the Midrashic translation here arose from looking on the word as based upon a similar root found in Arabic, and meaning, *to return*.

18. ε. שִׁמְעוּ. *ἤκουσαν* (שָׁמְעוּ).

γ. וּדְעִי. *καὶ οἱ ποιμαίνοντες* (וְרֹעֵי).

γ. עֵדָה אֶת־אֲשֶׁר־בָּם. *τὰ ποίμνια αὐτῶν*, reading (for ע' את) עֲדָרוֹת, a pl. however not found elsewhere. They render עֵדֶר by *π.* in xiii. 17, li. [xxviii.] 23. The remaining words with them doubtless coincided with M.T. We need not be surprised that the use of אֶת־א' ב' as virtually equivalent to a pronoun suffix did not prove a difficulty to them, inasmuch as Aq. himself here supplies a close parallel, rendering *μαρτυρίαν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς*.

19. γ. מַחְשְׁבוֹתָם. *ἀποστροφῆς αὐτῶν*, and so in xviii. 12, reading in both places מְשֻׁבָתָם, which noun they render similarly in v. 6. It is somewhat singular that except in that instance and in ii. 19 and viii. 5 the word מְשׁוּבָה has been something of a stumbling-block to them in this Book

(iii. 6, 8, 11, 12, 22, xiv. 7), while מח' has been accurately translated nine times.

עַל־דְּבָרַי. τῶν λόγων μου. This strange construction seems to be a corruption of τῷ λόγῳ μου (אQ), which is read by Compl. Ald. (so SH.). A has τοῖς λόγοις μ.

ξ α. וַיִּמְאֲסוּ־בָהּ. ἀπώσαντο, a free rendering, for the sake of smoothness.

20. (ε) תָּבוֹא. φέρετε, reading תָּבִיאוּ, and perhaps using for this purpose the ו which follows; or φ. may be a corruption (easy in uncials) for φέρεις (תָּבִיא), which agrees with Pesh. and Vulg.

21. ξ ι. וְכָשְׁלוּ בָם. καὶ ἀσθενήσουσιν (AQ add ἐν αὐτῇ), freely.

וְאָבָדוּ ק'. ἀπολοῦνται (יֹאבֵדוּ כ').

We may observe that l. [xxvii.] 41—43 is a close adaptation of the three verses (22—24) which here follow.

22. ξ ι. וְגוֹי גָּדוֹל. καὶ ἔθνη (A ἔθνος μέγα), followed by the verb in the sing., (but Q ἐγερθήσονται). Aq. Symm. Theod. have (καὶ) ἔθνος *μέγα καὶ βασιλεῖς πολλοί, shewing that by their time the text here had become completely conformed to that of l. 41. With their reading SH. agrees, but makes the κ. β. π. alone to be the additional matter supplied by the Heb. The ἔθνη (BאQ) is probably a conjectural emendation of a scribe, consequent

upon a removal from his copy of μ. κ. β. π. unaccompanied by a correction of the following verb from pl. to sing. The passage is interesting, in exhibiting a M.T. *partially* revised (as containing גָּדוֹל), and in illustrating the character of B as shewing what Ceriani (quoted by Driver, *Notes on Samuel*, *Introd.* p. l) calls 'the unrevised text of LXX., as it was before Origen.'

*ξ i.* מִיַּרְכְּתֵי־אָרֶץ. *ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς*, freely; but so always elsewhere (xxv. 32 [xxxii. 18], xxxi. 7 [xxxviii. 8], l. [xxvii.] 41).

23. *ξ i.* וְכִידוֹן. *καὶ ζιβύνην*, *lance.* In l. [xxvii.] 42 O′ renders *ἐγχειρίδιον.* This is possibly an example of their being influenced by the sound of the Heb. word (reading however in that case ר for ד). See on ii. 32 for transpositions arising from the same cause.

*ε.* יְרַחֵמוּ. *ἐλεήσει.* The *mater lectionis* at the end was absent.

*ξ a.* קוֹלָם. *φωνὴ αὐτοῦ*, so as to harmonize with *ἐλεήσει.*

*om. d.* וְעַל. *ἐφ'.*

*γ.* יִרְכָּבוּ עָרוּךְ. *καὶ ἅρμασιν παρατάξεται*, reading וְרֶכֶב יַעֲרוֹךְ.

*ε.* כְּאִישׁ. *ὡς πῦρ* (כְּאֵשׁ). Similarly in l. [xxvii.] 42.

25. אַל־תֵּצְאוּ ק׳. μὴ ἐκπορεύεσθε (תֵּצְאִי כ׳), and similarly for the following verb.

ζ. לְאֹיֵב מָגוֹר. τῶν ἐχθρῶν παροικεῖ, not as Wo. (לְאֹיְבִים תָּגוּר), but dividing the words differently, and so reading לְאֹיְבָם גָּר.

26. עָלֵינוּ. ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, probably a corruption for ἐφ' ἡμᾶς.

27. ε (and γ). בְּעַמִּי מִבְצָר. ἐν λαοῖς δεδοκιμασμένοις. This rendering took the first word to be the pl. const., and read the second apparently as a subst. from the root בחן. This latter word however has given rise to much difficulty. St Jer. testifies to the sense "clausum atque circumdatum" as that given to the word by O′ as well as by Symm. who accordingly, by the testimony of MS. 86, had πολιορκουμένῳ. 'Εν λαοῖς (μου) συγκεκλεισμένοις is the reading found in MSS. 86, 88, 98 (so SH.), and ἐν λαῷ (μου) συγκεκλεισμένῳ in 22, 36, and others. Aq. διηρημένῳ, but perhaps διηρμένῳ (see Field's note). Vulg. has *robustus*. There is much to be said for the view, mentioned by Prof. Cheyne, that מ׳ was a marg. gloss, intended as a reminder of the parallel passage in i. 18.

ε. וְתֵדַע וּבָחַנְתָּ. καὶ γνώσῃ με ἐν τῷ δοκιμάσαι με. All that is needed (not so Wo.) is to suppose that O′ read it as וְתֵדְעִ בָּחֲנֵנִי, and rendered rather freely.

28. *om.* (*a*). סָרֵי סוֹרְרִים. ἀνήκοοι. ἀν. is used to render סוֹרֵר in v. 23. In the face of such expressions as קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים (Ex. xxix. 37 etc.), קָדְשֵׁי הַקֳּדָשִׁים (Lev. xxi. 22 etc.), עֶבֶד עֲבָדִים (Gen. ix. 25), we can scarcely suppose that the translators would have failed to recognise the force of this method of expressing the superlative. We must therefore consider סָרֵי to have been absent, rightly or wrongly, from their original. 21 Heb. MSS. have שָׂרֵי, supported by Targ. (רַבְרְבֵיהוֹן), Pesh. (ܡܠܟܝ̈ܗܘܢ), Vulg. (*principes*). So Aq. ἄρχοντες.

29. ξ *i.* נָחַר. ἐξέλιπεν 1° (A ἐξέλειπεν), a free rendering of Niph. of חרר, *to burn*. A parallel occurs in Ezek. xv. 4. In the next clause ἐξέλιπεν (A ἐξέλειπεν) renders תַּם. Obs. the identity of the Gk rendering of different Heb. verbs in the immediate context.

*om. a* and *γ*. וְרָעִים לֹא נִתָּקוּ. πονηρία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐτάκη (Q -κησαν), reading רָעָם לֹא נָמַק.

30. ε. קִרְאוּ. καλέσατε (קָרְאוּ).

vii. 1. *om. a.* O′ *vacat.* The Heb. preface was introduced for the sake of smoothness, but purposely expressed in somewhat vague terms, so as not to commit its introducers to the identification

(in substance) of the following prophecy with that of ch. xxvi. Aq. Symm. Theod. (and so SH.) agree with M.T. in this and the following verse.

2. *om. c.* עֲמֹד...וְאָמַרְתָּ. O′ *vacat.* The Heb. was suggested by the words which (in xxvi. 2) introduce what is at any rate a similar prophecy. The שַׁעַר here, as opposed to the חֲצַר of the later passage, may easily have its source in the language of xxvi. 10. Comp. xxxvi. 10, where both are mentioned. Tradition also might easily influence the wording of such an insertion in reference to one, memories of whom were cherished, and whose connexion with the Messianic hope was marked (Matt. xvi. 14; comp. John i. 21, vi. 14, vii. 40).

*om. c.* הַבָּאִים...לַיהוָֹה. O′ *vacat.* The Heb. was suggested by such passages as xvii. 20, xxii. 2; just as O′ (or a copyist) made a similar insertion in xix. 3.

3. *om. a.* צְבָאוֹת. O′ *vacat* (Q τῶν δυν.). See on ii. 22.

וַאֲשַׁכְּנָה אֶתְכֶם. καὶ (A ins. οὐ) κατοικιῶ ὑμᾶς. Aq., deviating from M.T., has καὶ σκηνώσω (וְאֶשְׁכְּנָה) σὺν ὑμῖν.

4. *a a.* הַשֶּׁקֶר. O′ (or a copyist) added ὅτι τὸ παράπαν οὐκ ὠφελήσουσιν ὑμᾶς, suggested by the last words of *v.* 8.

*om. a.* הֵיכַל יְהוָֹה 3°. O′ *vacat.*

*ξ i.* הֵמָּה. ἐστίν, a loose translation. Comp. 2 Chr. viii. 11, where 'ה, referring, as here, to a building or group of buildings, is similarly rendered.

7. לְמִן־עוֹלָם וְעַד־עוֹלָם. *ἐξ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως αἰῶνος.* The exact Heb. expression is not found elsewhere. The nearest approach is in Ps. ciii. [cii.] 17, where, as here, O′ brings out that it is *a parte ante*, as well as *a parte post.*

8. *κ.* הִנֵּה. *εἰ δὲ* (Q* adds *καὶ*), reading הֵן; and taking it in the Aramaic sense. Spohn's view (l.c. i. 114), that *εἰ δὲ* is a corruption of *ἰδού*, is less good.

*om. a.* לָכֶם. O′ *vacat.* The Heb. is apparently an insertion from *v.* 4, where the word is duly rendered.

9. *β b.* O′ (or a copyist) changed the order of the first three verbs to accord with that of the Decalogue.

10. *a a.* *τοῦ κακῶς εἶναι ὑμῖν* (belonging in sense to the preceding *v.*), an insertion suggested by the Heb. which occurs in a similar context at the end of *v.* 6.

*om.* (*a*). בַּבַּיִת הַזֶּה. *ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ* (A om.).

*θ.* נִצַּלְנוּ. Ἀπεσχήμεθα, taking it as=נֶאֱצַלְנוּ. This verb occurs in Niph. in Ezek. xlii. 6. The root would be known to O′ through Gen. xxvii. 36, while in Eccl. ii. 10 the Ḳal is found in a sense

still closer to that which they attribute to the verb in this instance. The loss of א (if they read the same consonants in their text as we do) would probably not give them much trouble. Although they did not recognise תֵּזֹלִי in ii. 36 (see note there) as a case of the kind, yet in xxii. 23 their rendering (*καταστενάξεις*) of what M.T. gives as נֵחַנְתְּ can only be explained by their reading it נֶאֱנַחְתְּ = נֵנַחְתְּ.

11. *om.* (*a*). הָיָה. O′ *vacat.*

*ξ i.* הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה. *ὁ οἶκός μου*, freely.

*a a.* עָלָיו. *ἐπ' αὐτῷ* (א* *αὐτῶν*) *ἐκεῖ.* The last word is probably suggested by such passages as 1 K. viii. 16, 29.

13. *om. a.* נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה. O′ *vacat.*

*om. a.* הַשְׁכֵּם וְדַבֵּר. O′ *vacat.* 'ה, coupled with another infin., is frequent in J. In *v.* 25, xxv. 3, 4, xxvi. [xxxiii.] 5, xxxii. [xxxix.] 33, xxxv. [xlii.] 14, xliv. [li.] 4 it is represented in O′, while in xxxv. 15, as here, it is found in M.T. alone. The remaining occurrences in M.T. (xi. 7, xxix. 19) are passages lacking in O′.

*a d.* שְׁמַעְתֶּם. *ἠκούσατέ μου.*

14. וְעָשִׂיתִי. *καὶ ποιήσω*; but AQ *τοίνυν κἀγὼ π.*

לַבַּיִת. *τῷ οἴκῳ*; but A *τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ*, freely.

15. *om.* (*a*). אֶת־כָּל־אֲחֵיכֶם. *τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν.*

16. *ξ i.* וְאַל־תִּשָּׂא בַעֲדָם רִנָּה וּתְפִלָּה וְאַל־תִּפְגַּע־בִּי. *καὶ μὴ ἀξίου τοῦ ἐλεηθῆναι αὐτούς, καὶ μὴ εὔχου καὶ μὴ προσέλθῃς μοι περὶ αὐτῶν* (A *om. καὶ μὴ εὔχ....αὐτῶν*) freely. The rendering on the later occurrence of the first clause (xi. 14) is closer (*καὶ μὴ ἀ. περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν δεήσει καὶ προσευχῇ*).

*om. a.* אֹתָךְ. O′ *vacat.*

18. *a d ter.* *αὐτῶν* is three times inserted by O′, probably only as a free rendering in each case.

*ζ* (*b*). לִמְלֶכֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם. *τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,* the other Gk Versions *τῇ βασιλίσσῃ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.* But in xliv. [li.] 17, 18, 19, 25 מ׳ (with note א׳ חסר) is rendered *τῇ βασιλίσσῃ τοῦ οὐ.* and so Symm. and presumably the others. Stade (*Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wiss.* 1886, pp. 123–132), holding that the context proves מ׳ הש׳ to refer to the worship of the heavenly bodies, maintains that the difference of rendering on the part of O′ suggests that they read here לצבא הש׳. He considers however that מלכת (מַלְכוּת) was the original reading, and that it was perhaps owing to the new sense which the 'kingdom of heaven' came later to bear for the Jews, that the Mass. pronunciation arose,

and with it the interpretation, *queen of heaven*. In a later article however (*ibid.* pp. 289–339) he inclines to the belief that צבא was the original word, altered as 'eine euphemistische Correctur' to the synonymous expression למ׳ הש׳, with א׳ inserted in xliv. according to the requirements of the later and stricter orthography. He considers that this use of מ׳ as synonymous with צ׳ arose from the Rabb. exegesis of Gen. ii. 1, 2 (מְלַאכְתּוֹ = צְבָאָם). He holds that the τῇ β. of xliv. may have arisen from the influence of later versions on O''s text. There are however, we may reply, many instances of O''s inconsistent renderings of the same Heb. pointing (suggesting different translators). Moreover on this later hypothesis the unanimity of the other Gk Versions in τῇ βασ. remains obscure. Kuenen (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Bibl. Wissenschaft, übersetzt von K. Budde*, Freiburg in B. und Leipzig, 1894) controverts Stade, and maintains the sense 'queen of heaven.'

וְהַסֵּךְ. *καὶ ἔσπεισαν.* A has *καὶ σπεῖσαι.* This, though in a sense more literal, is yet inferior as a rendering of the Heb. infin., which, as is shewn by the absence of ל, is not to be coupled with לַעֲשׂוֹת.

20. *om.* (*a*). אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה. Κύριος. See on ii. 22.

ξ *i.* עֵץ. *πᾶν ξύλον*, freely.

*ξ i.* הַשָּׂדֶה. *τοῦ ἀγροῦ αὐτῶν* (Q om. *αὐτ.*), a tolerably clear case of free rendering, as the presence of the article prevents us from conjecturing that O′ read 'שדה = שָׂדֵהֶם.

וְעַל־פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה. A differs from M.T., having *καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα* (so Q *πάντα*) *τὰ γενήματα* (this is the spelling in Bא also) *αὐτῆς*, and at end of *v.* introduces from iv. 4 or xxi. 12 *καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ σβέσων.* This however may represent a variant on M.T. here, as several of Kenn. and de Rossi's MSS. have מכבה.

21. *om. a.* צְבָאוֹת א׳ י׳. O′ *vacat.*

*ξ i.* בָּשָׂר. *κρέα*, freely.

23. *ξ i.* בְּכָל־הַדֶּרֶךְ. *ἐν πάσαις* (א om. *πάσ.*) *ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου*, freely.

24. *a d.* שָׁמְעוּ. *ἤκουσαν* (AQ *εἰσήκ.*) *μου.*

*ξ i.* וְלֹא הִטּוּ אֶת־אָזְנָם. *καὶ οὐ προσέσχεν* (A *προσέσχον*) *τὸ οὖς αὐτῶν*, a free rendering, repeated *v.* 26, where however א (not A) has *-σχον*, and so SH. there, though not here.

*om. a.* בְּמֹעֵצוֹת בִּשְׁרִרוּת. *τοῖς* (א *ἐν τοῖς*) *ἐνθυμήμασιν* (A *ἐπιθ.*). It is probable that 'במ is the contribution of a glossator, to explain the rare word 'ש, and so was not found in O′'s text. If so, *ἐνθ.*, as rendering of 'ש, agrees with iii. 17, where see note.

25. *ξ i.* אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם. *οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν*, freely.

יוֹם הַשְׁכֵּם. *ἡμέρας καὶ ὄρθρου.* See on *v.* 13.

26. אֶת־עָרְפָּם. *τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν.* Wo., substituting צַוָּארָם, is not only inconsistent (see xvii. 23, and xix. 15) but wrong. See further in Dr Driver, *Expos.* l.c. p. 328.

*om. d.* הֵרֵעוּ. O′ *vacat.* It is possible however that they may have read הַרְבֵּה or הִרְבּוּ. The M.T. has scarcely the air of an insertion.

27. *om.* (*a*). אֶת־כָּל... (28) אֲלֵיהֶם. O′ *vacat.* It may be a case in which it preserves the (shorter and) more genuine text, but on the other hand the similarity between the commencement of the two verses renders very conceivable an accidental omission from the first to the second אֲלֵיהֶם on the part of the translator.

28. *a b.* אֲלֵיהֶם. O′ adds *τὸν λόγον τοῦτον.*

*ξ g.* זֶה הַגּוֹי. *τοῦτο τὸ ἔθνος,* illustrating weakness in Heb. grammar.

*om. a.* יְהוָֹה אֱלֹהָיו. *Κυρίου*; Q adds *τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν.*

*om. c.* וְנִכְרְתָה. O′ *vacat.* The Heb. was perhaps suggested by Joel i. 5, where the verse ends with נִכְרַת מִפִּיכֶם.

29. *δ.* שְׁפָיִם. *χειλέων.* See on iii. 2, 21.

*γ.* עָבְרָתוֹ. *τὴν ποιοῦσαν* (Q *ποιήσασαν*) *ταῦτα*, reading ד for ר.

31. *ε.* בָּמוֹת. *βωμόν.* The number may easily have been ambiguous from omission of ו. The Targ. also, as Wo. points out, took it as sing., but Aq. Symm. as pl.

*a d.* צִוִּיתִי. *ἐνετειλάμην αὐτοῖς.*

*ξ i.* וְלֹא עָלְתָה עַל-לִבִּי. *καὶ οὐ* (A *οὐδέ*, without *καὶ*) *διενοήθην ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου*, a free rendering, and so in xix. 5. On the other hand we have the literal rendering of the same idiom in A in 2 K. [4 K.] xii. 5 [4], *ὃ ἐὰν ἀναβῇ* (B has *λάβῃ*) *ἐπὶ καρδίαν κ.τ.λ.* Comp. *ἀνέβη ἴασις* in viii. 22.

32. *ξ i* or *ε.* וְלֹא-יֵאָמֵר. *οὐκ ἐροῦσιν ἔτι*, either reading יֹאמְרוּ, or, more probably, rendering freely, while avoiding, as it is interesting to notice, the *personal* use of the verb in the sense of call, which would be incorrect Heb.

*ξ i.* הַהֲרֵגָה. *τῶν ἀνῃρημένων*, a free rendering.

בְּתֹפֶת. *ἐν τῷ Ταφέθ*, but A *ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Ταφέθ.*

מֵאֵין מָקוֹם. *διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπάρχειν τόπον*, *from want of room elsewhere.* This is more accurate than A.V. (with which agrees text of R.V.).

33. נִבְלַת. *οἱ νεκροί.* So in xix. 7, but xxxiv. [xli.] 20 has *τὰ θνησιμαῖα.*

31–33 are found in substance again xix. 5–7. It is instructive to compare M.T. and O′ in the two passages. In the later one (i) the expression "and their daughters" is absent from both Heb. and Gk, thus throwing a certain amount of doubt upon its genuineness here; (ii) עֹלוֹת לַבָּעַל is not represented in O′; and so for (iii) וְלֹא דִבַּרְתִּי (a few Gk MSS. and SH. read it); while (iv) a different translator's hand is suggested by the fact that there הַתֹּפֶת and גֵּיא (see on ii. 23) are translated respectively *διάπτωσις* (but not so MS. 88, SH.) and *πολυάνδριον* (*bis*; so MS. 88, SH.), at which St Jer. records his surprise.

34. *a d.* הָאָרֶץ. *πᾶσα ἡ γῆ.* So four MSS. cited by Kenn. and one more by de Rossi.

viii. 1. יוֹצִיאוּ ק׳. *ἐξοίσουσιν*, against וְיוֹצִיאוּ כ׳.

2. וּשְׁטָחוּם. *καὶ ψύξουσιν.* For this sense of *ψ.*, *to spread out to dry in the open air*, see 2 S. [2 K.] xvii. 19, and comp. *ψυγμοὺς* in Numb. xi. 32.

*a d.* וְלַיָּרֵחַ. O′ adds *καὶ πρὸς πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας.*

*ξ i.* דְּרָשׁוּם. (*ὧν*) *ἀντείχοντο*, a loose translation. The same Heb. root in xxxviii. [xlv.] 4 corresponds to *χρησμολογεῖ.* Here Wo. makes O′ read דָּבְקוּ בָם; there by a still more violent substitution נִבָּא.

*ξ a.* יֵאָסְפוּ. *κοπήσονται.* The Heb. root, as occurring frequently in a sense connected with burial in Genesis and elsewhere, must have been familiar to O′. It is natural to conjecture that either from illegibility in their MS. or for some other reason they (or an early copyist) imported the present rendering from the parallel passage, xvi. 4 (יִסָּפְדוּ). It may be worth noting however that in xxv. 33 [xxxii. 19], where both verbs occur in a similar context in M.T., they appear to have been absent from O′'s text.

(*β a* and) *μ.* לְדֹמֶן. *εἰς παράδειγμα*, apparently euphemistic (Wo. suggests דִּמְיֹן, but xxv. 33 is against it); so in ix. 21 [22], xvi. 4, in both of which passages, as here, Jews are spoken of. O′ apparently did not think it necessary to be so tender of the feelings of other nations. At any rate in xxv. 33 [xxxii. 19] the rendering is *εἰς κόπρια*.

3. *γ.* וְנִבְחַר. *ὅτι εἵλοντο* (ℵA *-λαν-*). The literalness of the translation in the case of the following words (*καὶ πᾶσι κ.τ.λ.*) makes it probable that the same is the case here, and that O′ read כִּי נִבְחַר. Conversely in xxxvii. [xliv.] 16 O′ (*καὶ ἦλθον*) has preserved the right reading, where M.T. has כִּי בָא. See further in Dr Driver's note on 1 S. ii. 21.

*om. a.* הָרָעָה. O′ *vacat.*

*ξ i.* בְּכָל־הַמְּקֹמוֹת. ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, freely.

*om. a.* הַנִּשְׁאָרִים 2°. O′ *vacat.* Evidently an accidental repetition from the previous line, as Prof. Cheyne (*Pulpit Comm. in loco*) points out. His argument however against the word as violating grammatical concord cannot be maintained. מְקֹמוֹת occurs 17 times in O. T. On 13 of these occasions there is no such concord as would determine the gender; in 3 it is masc. In the remaining case (2 S. xvii. 12) the word whose gender is determined by it is fem. in 'כ, but masc. in 'ק.

*om. a.* אֲלֵיהֶם (4)....נְאֻם. O′ *vacat.* From SH. however it would appear that of the five Heb. words now unrepresented וְאָמַרְתָּ originally found a place in O′. Καὶ ἐρεῖς might easily be omitted by confusion with the immediately preceding ἐκεῖ, the ὅτι being subsequently inserted to introduce the fresh utterance, which turns from the description of the punishment to dwell upon the conduct that has led to it.

4. *ξ i.* הֲיִפְּלוּ וְלֹא־יָקוּמוּ. Μὴ ὁ πίπτων οὐκ ἀνίσταται; perhaps the Heb. was indistinct.

5. *om.* (*a*). יְרוּשָׁלַםִ. O′ *vacat.* עָם at once masc. and fem. (for fem. use comp. Ex. v. 16; Jud. xviii. 7) points to some early corruption.

נִצַּחַת. ἀναιδῆ. The notion of perpetuity

belonging to the root (comp. לָנֶצַח, εἰς τέλος in Pss. *passim*) is well expressed here by O''s rendering (Ct. iii. 5 for rendering of לָנֶצַח). On the contrary Aq. Symm. (φιλόνεικον) and St Jer. (*contentiosa*) all translate as though the root were נצה; from which however it would be difficult to derive M.T. Is it one of the cases (see on vi. 14) where we may suppose Aq. to have chosen to differ in spite of better knowledge, and so to have influenced the work even of Christians as Symm. and St Jer.?

ξ *i.* הֶחֱזִיקוּ. κατεκρατήθησαν, surely a loose translation as regards voice, yet acquiesced in by Wo.

δ. בַּתַּרְמִית. ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει (αὐτῶν). So in xiv. 14 (ק'), while in xxiii. 26 the rendering is τὰ θελήματα. It is evident that O' was dependent upon the context for the meaning of this word, which, possessed of the frequent Aramaic ending ־ִית, characteristic of J. (see on iii. 17), occurs but twice outside this Book, and is absent from the Pentateuch. So in Ps. cxix. [cxviii.] 118 they have ἐνθύμημα, while they are more fortunate in Zeph. iii. 13, δολία.

6. γ. הִקְשַׁבְתִּי וָאֶשְׁמָע. ἐνωτίσασθε δὴ καὶ ἀκούσατε. By much slighter changes in M.T. than those which Wo. proposes (הַקְשִׁיבוּ נָא וּשְׁמָעוּ) we

may obtain O′'s rendering. They took the first word to be 2nd p. s., then gave it (wrongly) a future (= imperative) sense, while for the second they read נָא שִׁמְעִי. Wo.'s comment on the passage (p. 138) is far from convincing.

δ. לוֹא־כֵן. οὐχ οὕτως (a rendering of M.T. which Wo. defends. See preceding note). Comp. xxiii. 10 (where, in order to maintain this rendering of כֵּן, they were obliged to omit the negative particle) and xlviii. [xxxi.] 30: so in 2 K. [4 K.] vii. 9, xvii. 9; Is. xvi. 6. In Prov. xv. 7 on the other hand we have οὐκ ἀσφαλεῖς (καρδίαι). Here the Targ. (כִּדְכָשַׁר) and Pesh. (ܟܐܢܐ) give the correct sense.

ξ *i* and ε. כֻּלֹּה שָׁב. διέλιπεν (reading כָּלָה) ὁ τρέχων, a free rendering.

γ. בַּמִּלְחָמָה. ἐν χρεμετισμῷ (αὐτοῦ), reading בְּמִצְהָלָה. מצ׳ is so rendered *v.* 16, xiii. 27.

7. δ. חֲסִידָה. ἡ ἀσιδά, a transliteration (comp. χαυῶνας in vii. 18). So in Job xxxix. 13, whereas Deut. xiv. 18 [17] has πελεκᾶνα, Zech. v. 9 ἔποπος, Ps. civ. [ciii.] 17 ἐρωδιοῦ.

ε. מוֹעֲדֶיהָ. τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῆς. Kenn. cites three MSS. which omit י, to which de Rossi adds one, and two more *pr. manu*.

*a c.* וְסִים (וסוס כ׳) וְעָגוּר. καὶ χελιδὼν ἀγροῦ,

*στρουθία.* These names of birds were evidently not familiar to O′, whose addition of *ἀγ.* to *χελ.* hardly (with Wo.) points to an identification of it with the שְׂדֵי זִיז of Ps. l. [xlix.] 11, but is rather the result of conflation, the transliteration *ἀγοὺρ* being corrupted into the present form. The second conjunction has probably been lost in the process of corruption.

*η.* מִשְׁפַּט. *τὰ κρίματα*, reading מִשְׁפְּטֵי, the more readily because of the י (י״י) which follows.

8. *om. a.* אָכֵן הִנֵּה. O′ *vacat.* 'א may well be a marginal gloss on the first part of the verse, and 'ה an insertion suggested by the הִנֵּה of the next verse.

*ξ i.* לַשֶּׁקֶר עָשָׂה. *εἰς μάτην ἐγενήθη*, freely.

9. *ξ i.* בִּדְבַר. *τὸν νόμον* (אAQ *τὸν λόγον*).

10. *om. c.* From כִּי to the end, also *vv.* 11, 12, O′ *vacat.* The passage is almost identical with vi. 12–15, and is probably interpolated here.

13. *a d* and *ε.* אָסֹף אֲסִיפֵם. (*καὶ*) *συνάξουσιν τὰ γενήματα αὐτῶν.* O′ read אָסְפוּ אֲסִיפָם, refusing to recognise the play on the roots אסף in Ḳal and סוף in Hiph., but making the second word a substantive known to them from Ex. xxiii. 16 (*συντελείας*), xxxiv. 22 (*συναγωγῆς*). Comp. אֲסֵפָה (*συναγωγήν*), Is. xxiv. 22. As for the *καί*, a ו may

have been suggested by an abbreviation of the previous word (י״י).

*om.* (*a*). וְאֶתֵּן לָהֶם יַעַבְרוּם. O′ *vacat.* The Heb. words are as obscure as anything in the Book, and all proposed renderings of them as they now stand are forced, e.g. (i) And I deliver them up to those who pass over them, (ii) And I gave them that (viz. my Law) which they transgress, (iii) And I appoint unto them those that shall pass over them. The clause is perhaps a corruption of an interpolation. Prof. Cheyne would point the ו with Sh'va. Adopting this punctuation, I would conjecture the clause to have read thus וְלֹא אֶתֵּן לָהֶם עֲבוּרָם. The corruption of 'ע into its present form would lead to the subsequent omission of the negative. In the time of Aq. Theod. the ו seems to have been absent from the last word. They render *καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτοῖς καὶ παρῆλθεν αὐτούς* (וַעֲבָרָם).

14. *γ*. וְנִדְּמָה. *καὶ ἀποριφῶμεν* (AQ *ἀπορρ.*), reading וְנִרְמֶה. Comp. xlvii. [xxix.] 5, li. [xxviii.] 6. Aq. Symm. (*καὶ σιγήσωμεν*) SH. apparently took the word as the Mass., viz. as Ḳal, pointed in the Aramaic form (comp. יִדְּמוּ in Lam. ii. 10). On the other hand the Niph. (נִדְּמוּ; see xlix. 26, l. 30, li. 6), to which some (e.g. Keil *in loco*) consider this Mass. pointing to be equivalent,

would mean, *Let us perish*, whereas the Hiph. which follows (*has reduced us to silence*) agrees better with the former sense.

*om. a.* שָׁם. O′ *vacat.*

*om. a.* יְהוָֹה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. ὁ θεός.

*η.* לַיהוָֹה. ἐναντίον (Q ἐνώπιον) αὐτοῦ (לי read as לו).

15. *ι.* קַוֵּה (Aram. for קַוֵּה, so xiv. 19). συνήχθημεν, taking the root in the sense borne by Niph. in iii. 17 (συναχθήσονται).

δ. בְעָתָה. σπουδή (but in xiv. 19 ταραχή). Scholz (p. 89) suggests באלה. Perhaps this is a typographical error for בֶּהָלָה, inasmuch as the latter in xv. 8 (so Ps. lxxviii. [lxxvii.] 33) is rendered by σπουδή.

16. *ξ i.* נִשְׁמַע. ἀκουσόμεθα (A -σομαι). The word is ambiguous, even when pointed. The subsequent verbs determine the sense, and shew that O′ made the wrong choice.

δ. נַחֲרַת. φωνὴν ὀξύτητος. The Heb. word occurs elsewhere (and there in a masc. form) only in Job xxxix. 20, where O′ has στηθέων, perhaps connecting it with the Aram. חֲדִי (στῆθος in Dan. ii. 32). Here they apparently saw a substantive from the root חדד. This is easier than to suppose

(with Wo.) that they identified the word with דַּהֲרָה of Jud. v. 22. It would hardly have suggested ὀξ. rather than some simpler expression such as they employed there (*σπουδῇ ἔσπευσαν*).

*a c.* אַבִּירָיו. *ἱππασίας ἵππων αὐτοῦ*, a conflation of renderings. The Heb. is used of heroes (xlvi. [xxvi.] 15; but O′ there *μόσχος*) or oxen (Ps. xxii. 13 etc.), but is twice elsewhere used by J. for *horses*, where O′ has not been equally successful in perceiving its meaning (xlvii. [xxix.] 3, *ποδῶν*; l. [xxvii.] 11, *ταῦροι*).

*ε.* וַיָּבוֹאוּ וַיֹּאכְלוּ. *καὶ ἥξει καὶ καταφάγεται.* The *matres lect.* apparently were absent.

17. δ. צִפְעֹנִים. *θανατοῦντας*, evidently a loose rendering in the absence of more precise knowledge. Accordingly O′ varies on the other occurrences of the word (Is. xi. 8 *ἔκγονοι ἀσπίδων*, lix. 5 *ἀσπίδες*; Prov. xxiii. 32 *κεραστής*). Aq. characteristically has in his 2nd ed. *σκοπεύοντας* (or *σκοπευτάς*), the first two letters suggesting the root צָפָה, while in the 1st ed. he has *βασιλίσκους*. Vulg. has *regulos*.

*om. a.* נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה. O′ *vacat.*

18. ζ. מַבְלִיגִיתִי. *Ἀνίατα*, reading the Heb. as two words מִבְּלִי גֵהָה, and the verse as a part of the sentence commenced in *v.* 17. The root גהה is used in a similar sense in Hos. v. 13, where

in the parallel clause to that containing it O′ employs *ἰᾶσθαι*. The Heb. here is *ἅπαξ λεγ*. and is almost certainly the result of some early corruption. Five MSS. (see Kenn.) read מבלי גיתי, and one מבלי נתי; de Rossi adds thirteen more. So apparently Theod. *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὕβρις*, connecting the latter word with גֵּוָה (xiii. 17)=גַּאֲוָה. The Pesh. connected the word with בלה and יגה (ܒܠܝܬ ܒܟܡܬܝ). On the other hand from the sense of בלג, *to be joyful* (Ps. xxxix. 14), we have the renderings of Aq. *τέρψις* or *ἱλαρότης* and of Symm. *ἐμπαίζεις μοι*.

*η.* לִבִּי. *καρδίας ὑμῶν*. If we can argue anything as to a verse so corrupt as this appears to be, we may suppose that O′ read לבּ׳, and put on the wrong affix, an error which followed from their way of taking the earlier part.

19. שַׁוְעַת. *κραυγῆς*. SH. marks with an asterisk. H. and P. mention 23 MSS. as omitting the word.

מַלְכָּהּ. *βασιλεύς* (Q* *ἰατρός*). It is unlikely that O′ would have failed to render the pronoun. It is probably therefore a corruption in O′'s Heb. MS., to which the sound of the corresponding Aram. would lend itself. Wo. is in error in saying that the Targ. (מַלְכָּא) agrees with M.T.

20. *β a.* קָצִיר...קָיִץ. *θέρος* generally corresponds to the second of these and *ἄμητος* to the first. The two Gk words however are in this case reversed. It is by no means necessary to suppose that the order of O′'s Heb. text was not that of M.T. The transposition may be explained on the principle mentioned on ii. 32 (*-α-η-*, *α-η-*). See other references in note on ii. 19.

21. *om. d.* הָשְׁבַּרְתִּי. O′ *vacat.* Apparently an accidental omission. *Συνετρίβην* is found in MSS. 22, 36, and others, and SH. agrees.

*a c.* הַצֳּרִי (22) שַׁמָּה הֶחֱזִקַתְנִי. *ἀπορίᾳ κατ-ισχυσάν με ὠδῖνες ὡς τικτούσης, (22) μὴ ῥητίνη.* O′ combines the blunder and the correction. 'הצ was first read in the sense which צָרָה bears in l. [xxvii.] 43 (*θλῖψις*; in xlix. 24 [xxx. 13] the l. word is lacking in O′), and afterwards corrected (in marg.) in accordance with the rendering of צֳרִי in xlvi. [xxvi.] 11, li. [xxviii.] 8 (*ῥητίνη*), and so finally incorporated in the text.

22. עָלְתָה אֲרֻכַת. *ἀνέβη ἴασις*, a Hebraism. Comp. on vii. 31. So Hiph. of עלה is represented by *ἀνάγειν* in xxx. [xxxvii.] 17, xxxiii. [xl.] 6.

23 [Gk and A.V. ix. 1]. *a b.* וְאֶבְכֶּה. O′ adds *τὸν λαόν μου τοῦτον.*

ix. 1 [2]. *β b* and *ε.* אֹרְחִים. *ἔσχατον*, reading אֲחוֹרִים (as pl. of אָחוֹר), *back regions.* Comp. O′'s

mistake in Job viii. 13, where אָרְחוֹת is rendered *τὰ ἔσχατα.*

2 [3]. *ξ i.* קַשְׁתָּם. *ὡς τόξον* (A *τόξος*), freely.

*ξ i.* שֶׁקֶר וְלֹא לֶאֱמוּנָה גָּבְרוּ. *ψεῦδος καὶ οὐ πίστις ἐνίσχυσεν.* O′ thus (i) stops the verse differently from M.T., (ii) omits the ל of 'לאמ, which very probably was an accidental insertion in the Heb. induced by the neighbouring juxtaposition of ל and א, (iii) perhaps found גבר (גָּבַר) and read it as sing. From (ii) it follows that 'אמ and ולא are to be connected in sense with the preceding, not the following, words.

*om. a.* נְאֻם־יְהוָה. O′ *vacat* (Q *φησὶν Κύριος*).

3 [4]. *ξ i.* כָּל־אָח. *ἀδελφοῖς αὐτῶν* (A *ἑαυτῶν*), freely.

4 [5]. *om. d.* וֶאֱמֶת. *ἀλήθειαν.* The ו may easily have been inserted, owing to the ending of the previous word.

*e.* לִמְּדוּ. *μεμάθηκεν* (reading למד, which could be pointed as sing. or pl.).

4 [5] and 5 [6]. *ξ i* and *ζ* and *e.* נִלְאוּ (5) שִׁבְתְּךָ בְּתוֹךְ. *καὶ οὐ διέλιπον τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι.* (6) *τόκος ἐπὶ τόκῳ.* Scholz (p. 90) supposes that O′ read נ as ל and supplied 'das gewöhnlich nicht geschriebene א' (thus reading לא לאו). Or they may have understood a negative before נל'. The next word

they divided, so as to read שַׁב תּוֹךְ בְּתוֹךְ, the מִרְמָה בְּמִרְמָה suggesting this as a parallel arrangement. The τόκος ἐπὶ τόκῳ shews that O''s tendency pointed out by Wellhausen (*Der Text der Bücher Sam.*, p. 10) to render a Heb. word by a familiar Greek one of similar sound is not confined, as in the examples he there gives, to unfamiliar Heb. words. Indications of the same tendency are pointed out on ii. 32.

5 [6]. *om. a.* נְאֻם יְהוָה. O' *vacat* (Q φησὶν Κύριος).

6 [7]. *om. a.* יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. Κύριος (Q adds τῶν δυν.).

*om. d.* אֵיךְ. O' *vacat.* They may have interpreted it as a contraction (אָמֵן יְהוָה כִּי, see on iii. 19), and considered it, in the face of the opening words of the *v.*, a needless repetition.

(*a d.*) מִפְּנֵי. O' adds πονηρίας (א substituting τῆς). This seems a tolerably clear case of a word having fallen out of the original Heb. text. If π. were merely introduced through the influence of רָעַת in vii. 12, it is probable that they would have used the κακία, which had been employed there, while π. points to an independent rendering.

7 [8]. *ε.* שׁחוּט ק'. τιτρώσκουσα, reading with שׁוֹחֵט כ'. The Mass. emendation is not a happy one. The pass. ptcp. can only be explained *sharpened* (identifying with Aram. שְׁחַן; so Targ.

כְּגִיר דִּי מְחָרִיף, *like an arrow that is sharpened*, and so Pesh. ܡܫܢܢܐ).

*ξ i.* מִרְמָה דִּבֵּר בְּפִיו. *δόλια τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν*, a loose rendering, but, so far as the division of clauses is concerned, more symmetrical than M.T.

*ξ i.* אָרְבּוֹ. *τὴν ἔχθραν.* Wo.'s proposal (הָאֵיבָה) seems quite needless, when we have אֹרֵב translated by *ἐχθρός* in 1 S. xxii. 8.

8 [9]. *om. c.* בָּם. O′ *vacat.* See the parallel expressions in v. 9, 29.

9 [10]. *ξ i.* אֶשָּׂא. *λάβετε*, apparently reading שְׂאוּ.

*om. c.* וְנֶהִי. O′ *vacat.* Probably an insertion from *vv.* 17, 18, 19, inasmuch as the word presented no difficulty to O′ there, or in xxxi. 14 [xxxviii. 15], although a somewhat rare one outside J. and confined to later Books.

*δ.* נְאוֹת. *τὰς τρίβους.* The word seems not to have been familiar to O′. In xxv. 37 [xxxii. 23] they render *τὰ κατάλοιπα*, if that be not a corruption. In xxiii. 10 however they have *νομαί.* We may observe that נָוֶה seems also to have been a difficulty to them. Besides *νομή* as its rendering, they have *κατάλυμα, κατάλυσις, τόπος.*

*γ.* נִצְּתוּ. *ἐξέλιπον.* This is generally ex-

plained as a confusion between נתץ and נצת. That confusion no doubt had its effect elsewhere, but another explanation seems here to have a higher claim to probability. Exactly the same Greek is found in Zeph. iii. 6 as a fair though somewhat free rendering of נִצְדּוּ, the Niph. of צדה, *to lay waste.* It therefore seems not too much to conjecture that O′ read ד in the present case also. N.B. נִצְּתָה is correctly rendered by them in *v.* 11 [12].

*om. c.* עוֹבֵר. O′ *vacat.* Probably inserted from *v.* 11.

10 [11]. *γ.* לְגַלִּים. εἰς μετοικίαν, apparently reading it as גָּלוּת, which in xxiv. 5 is rendered τοὺς ἀποικισθέντας. In li. [xxviii.] 37 they seem to have connected it with כלה (ἀφανισμόν). It is remarkable that in 2 K. [4 K.] xix. 25 (οἰκεσίαι) they have been equally unsuccessful with this word.

11 [12]. *ε.* דִּבֶּר. λόγος (א*A ὁ λ.), reading דָּבָר.

*ξ i.* וְיַגִּדָהּ. ἀναγγειλάτω ὑμῖν (AQ ἡμῖν), loosely.

12 [13]. *a b.* יְהוָה. Κύριος, adding πρός μέ.

*om. c.* וְלֹא־הָלְכוּ בָהּ. O′ *vacat.* M.T. was probably suggested by xxxii. 23.

13 [14]. *δ.* שְׁרִרוּת. τῶν ἀρεστῶν (A ἐραστῶν). See on iii. 17.

*a a.* לִבָּם. O′ (supported by scarcely any Heb. MSS.) adds *τῆς κακῆς*, suggested by vii. 24.

14 [15]. *om. a.* צְבָאוֹת. O′ *vacat* (Q *τῶν δυν.*).

*om. a.* אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה. O′ *vacat.* The words are absent from both texts in the parallel passage xxiii. 5.

*γ.* לַעֲנָה. *ἀνάγκας.* In the parallel passage (xxiii. 15) the rendering is *ὀδύνην* (A *ὀδύνας*), which word is used Job xxx. 16 to represent עֳנִי. It is therefore clear that in both passages of J. the ל was ignored by O′.

15 [16]. *ξ i* and *a c.* עַד כַּלּוֹתִי אוֹתָם. *ἕως τοῦ ἐξαναλῶσαι* (but ℵQ *ἕως οὗ ἐξαναλώσω*) *αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ.* The last two words suggest an erroneous reading of the following כֹּה (בֹּה = בּוֹ) preceding its right rendering as *τάδε.*

16 [17]. *om. a.* צְבָאוֹת. O′ *vacat.*

*om. c.* הִתְבּוֹנְנוּ וְקִרְאוּ. *καλέσατε.* The insertion in the Heb. was apparently suggested by ii. 10. Some MSS. (including 22, 36) have *σύνετε καὶ* (with which SH. agrees).

*γ.* וּתְבוֹאֶינָה...וְתָבוֹאנָה. *καὶ ἐλθέτωσαν* (ℵA *ἐλθάτ.*)...*καὶ φθεγξάσθωσαν.* It seems a little suspicious that the same Heb. verb and in the same part of it (in slightly different forms) should be used in both parts of the *v.* Contrast the two imperatives קִרְאוּ and שִׁלְחוּ. We are thus pre-

pared to give favourable consideration to O′, who seem to have read the Hiph. of נבע, תַּבַּעְנָה, which is found Ps. cxix. 171, while φθ. is used to render Hiph. of this root in Ps. lxxviii. [lxxvii.] 2, xciv. [xciii.] 4. Outside the Psalter the verb is very limited in its use (Prov. i. 23, xv. 2, 28; Eccl. x. 1). Hence the familiar root בוא would easily be substituted.

17 [18]. *om. a.* וּתְמַהֵרְנָה. O′ *vacat* (but MSS. 22, 36 have *καὶ ταχυνάτωσαν*).

עָלֵינוּ. *ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*, but probably originally *ἡμᾶς* and altered for smoothness, and so for the two following suffixes, by a frequent change in MSS.

18 [19]. *γ.* מִצִּיּוֹן. *ἐν Σειών* (ℵAQ *Σι.*). For confusions of מ and ב in the MSS. used by O′ see Driver, *Samuel, Introd.* p. xxv, and comp. pp. lxv, lxviii.

*ξ a.* הִשְׁלִיכוּ. *ἀπερίψαμεν* (ℵAQ *ἀπερρ.*), altering the person of the verb on account of the preceding עָזַבְנוּ. SH. has 3rd sing. (understanding אָרֶץ as nom.) in text, and 1st pl. in marg.

19 [20]. *ξ i.* יְהוָֹה. *θεοῦ* (A *Κυρίου*), and so SH.

*ϵ.* אָזְנְכֶם. *τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν* (אָזְנֵיכֶם).

*ϵ.* דְּבַר־פִּיו. *λόγους* (דִּבְרֵי) *στόματος αὐτοῦ.*

נְהִי. *οἶκτον*, but ℵ*A have *οἰκτρόν*, while in

the previous verse BℵA have *οἰκτροῦ*, although Q and some cursives (so Compl.) have there *οἶκτου*.

20 [21]. δ. בְּאַרְמְנוֹתֵינוּ. *εἰς τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν*. For 'אר see on vi. 5, and for the 2nd p. pron. (*bis*) comp. *v.* 17 [18]. O′ seem to have read ד for ר, and connected the word with אֲדָמָה.

21 [22]. *om. a.* דַּבֵּר כֹּה נְאֻם־יְהוָה. O′ *vacat*, but MSS. 22, 36, and others have *θανάτῳ*, reading the Heb. as דֶּבֶר (just as they deal with דָּבָר in Is. ix. 7 [8]), and connecting with the previous *v.* St Jer. ascribes this reading "morte" to O′ and (so MS. 86) to Theod. SH. inserts with an asterisk this (ܒܡܘܬܐ) and the three words that follow. Prof. Cheyne's conjecture seems a happy one, that דֶּבֶר has been misplaced, and that it originally stood in the second clause of *v.* 20 [21], thus balancing מָוֶת, as in Ps. lxxviii. 50. As he points out, the four words which commence this *v.* in M.T. "are in three important respects contrary to the style of Jeremiah; (1) such a prefix as 'speak' is unique; (2) the phrase " כה נאם is also unique in Jeremiah; (3) where our prophet does use the form " נאם it is not at the beginning of a verse."

ξ *i.* וְנָפְלָה. *καὶ ἔσονται*. *Possibly* only a loose rendering. It is better to regard it as a very early error for *πέσονται* (so Scholz, p. 2, note).

μ. כְּדֹמֶן. *εἰς* (ℵQ* om. *εἰς*) *παράδειγμα*. See on viii. 2.

*a d.* הַשָּׂדֶה. *τοῦ πεδίου τῆς γῆς ὑμῶν.*

23 [24]. *om.* (*a*). אוֹתִי. O′ *vacat.*

*a d.* מִשְׁפָּט. *καὶ κρίμα.* The Babylonian Jews read 'וּמ.

*ξ i.* חָפַצְתִּי. *τὸ θέλημά μου,* freely.

25 [26]. *μ.* יְהוּדָה. Ἰδουμαίαν (ℵAQ τὴν Ἰδ.). The Targ. on this *v.* runs עַל מִצְרָאֵי וְעַל יְהוּדָה. וְעַל אֱדוֹמָאֵי וגו'. There is therefore no justification for Wo.'s claim (see his note in *Conspectus in loc.*) that it supports O′. O′ may have objected to the disgrace involved in placing Judah between Egypt and Edom in this list (MSS. 22, 23, 36 have Ἰουδάν, while SH. reads Ἰουδαίαν). It is more likely however that it was a transcriptional error, possibly made in good faith, but probably helped by the unwillingness referred to above. The result at any rate produced an absurd tautology.

*a d.* עֲרֵלִים. O′ adds *σαρκί.* It seems unlikely that a word so much needed for the parallelism of the clauses should have been originally lacking, while it is not hard to see a reason for its disappearance from M.T. If the 'כָּל־מוּל בע of *v.* 24 [25] be understood, as seems necessary, of nations circumcised in the letter though not in the spirit, viz. all those enumerated in this *v.*, it will follow that 'ע in the literal sense could not be predicated of them. To any therefore who understood (as the Mass. appear to have done) כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם of this *v.*

to be merely resumptive of those already named, and not to refer rather (as St Jer. saw) to the others (unnamed and uncircumcised), בִּבְשָׂרָם (which appears also in the Targ. בִּבְשַׂרְהוֹן) would present a difficulty to be solved only by the omission of the word. St Jer. is decided as to the practice of the rite by Egyptians, Edomites, Ammonites and Moabites, together with "Israelitas in solitudine commorantes."

x. 1. *ξ i.* אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָֹה. Κυρίου ὃν ἐλάλησεν (AQ add Κύριος), freely.

2. *ξ i.* דֶּרֶךְ. τὰς ὁδούς, freely, so as to harmonize better with the next clause.

תִּלְמָדוּ. μανθάνετε (A πορεύεσθε, probably not implying a variant). The construction of למד with אֶל is strange, but O′ appears to have had it, translating by κατά.

וּמֵאֹתוֹת. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων. א*, though virtually identical in sense, has a noteworthy variant, θηρίων.

γ. הַגּוֹיִם מֵהֵמָּה. αὐτὰ τοῖς προσώποις αὐτῶν, reading מִפְּנֵיהֶם הֵמָּה, perhaps owing to illegibility in the earlier word.

3. *ε.* כָּרְתוֹ. ἐκκεκομμένον. In view of the facility with which *matres lect.* might be misplaced, O′ may be considered to have read כְּרוּת.

*om.* (*a*). יְדֵי. O′ *vacat.*

*γ*. בַּמַּעֲצָד. *καὶ χώνευμα*, as though reading וּמֻצָּק = וּמוּצק. מֻצָּק is rendered *χωνευτὰ* in 1 K. vii. 16 [3 K. vii. 4]. For interchange of ב and ו comp. iii. 15.

4. *γ*. יְיַפֵּהוּ. *κεκαλλωπισμένα* (אAQ add *ἐστίν*), reading (so Wo.) מְיֻפִּים.

*β b*. בְּמַסְמְרוֹת וּבְמַקָּבוֹת. *ἐν σφύραις* (*hammers*, used to render פַּטִּישׁ in l. [xxvii.] 23) *καὶ ἥλοις*. The Heb. words can scarcely have been so unfamiliar, as to lead O′ to an accidental transposition of their senses. It is very possible that it may have been done purposely by them or their Heb. original, by way of conforming to the similar passage, Is. xli. 7, where 'מסמ is more closely joined with the verb. That the last part of that verse in O′ is verbally identical with their *v*. 5 here, although M.T. in the two places does not lend itself to such identity, would be almost conclusive for the above mentioned view, were it not that the omission here of *θήσουσιν αὐτὰ* in אA (so in 22, 23, 26, and other MSS. and Compl.) makes us doubtful whether it is genuine.

5. *om. a* and *β b*. וְלֹא יְדַבֵּרוּ. O′ *vacat*. The remainder of the *v*. in O′ follows *v*. 9.

6–8. *om. b*. O′ *vacat*. On a comparison of the shorter and the longer texts in the passage *vv*. 4–10, the logical superiority of the former and of the Greek order (see last note) will be apparent.

9. *a c.* כֶּסֶף...יוּבָא. *ἀργύριον τορευτόν ἐστιν, οὐ πορεύσονται, ἀργύριον προσβλητόν* (א *προβ.* and adds *ἐστιν*) *ἀπὸ Θαρσεὶς* (א *-σις*) *ἥξει.* A conflate rendering, the earlier part representing a text in which תַּרְשִׁישׁ may have been illegible. In the later part of the verse there is probably in both texts corruption such as can scarcely now be disentangled.

10. *om. b.* See on *vv.* 6–8.

12. *a b.* עֹשֵׂה. O′ prefixes Κύριος, it may be by way of clearness, and indeed it is almost needed here in consequence of the break in the logical connexion caused by *v.* 11, whose subject-matter no less than its language (Aramaic) indicates that in this place at any rate it is an intruder, although its history cannot now be traced with any certainty. In li. [xxviii.] 15–19 however, where the Heb. is all but identical with *vv.* 12–16 here, O′ also introduces the same Midrashic Κύριος without equally good reason, and that too, although there are signs that their translation there is an independent one, e.g. in *v.* 15 *ποιῶν, ἑτοιμάζων, συνέσει,* as against *ποιήσας, ἀνορθώσας, φρονήσει* here.

13. *om. d.* לְקוֹל תִּתּוֹ. O′ *vacat*, perhaps on account of the difficulty of the Heb. expression, although such a method of dealing with difficulties was somewhat rare with them (see note on p. 5). They were bolder in li. [xxviii.] 16, *εἰς φωνὴν ἔθετο,* rendering הֲמוֹן by *ἦχος* instead of *πλῆθος* as here.

.. הָאָרֶץ ק'. τῆς γῆς. כ' has אָרֶץ.

γ. רוּחַ. φῶς, an early error (from parallelism) for ἀνεμούς, which is in Compl. Ald. (this combines ἀνεμοὺς φῶς) with MSS. Q, 22, 23, 36, and others, and so SH.

14. ε. נִסְכּוֹ. ἐχώνευσεν (ℵQ -σαν), while li. [xxviii.] 17 has -σαν (but there A -σεν). Probably -σαν (נָסְכוּ) is O''s genuine text in both places. Taking into account the generally independent character of the rendering in the two passages, we need not suppose that the Heb. consonants in them differed any more than in M.T.

15. ξ i. תַּעְתֻּעִים. ἐνπεπαιγμένα (AQ ἐμπ.). Aq. here has μεμωκημένα, vain, and so O′ in li. [xxviii.] 18. MS. 233 has here the erroneous reading ἐμπεπηγμένα (and so SH.).

16. om. a. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל שֵׁבֶט. O′ vacat. וְשֵׁבֶט, without 'יש, occurs in the parallel passage li. 19, O′ rendering the clause there virtually as here. In both cases theirs probably represents the genuine text. In Ps. lxxiv. 2 the words שֵׁבֶט נַחֲלָתֶךָ are found in reference to Israel. A glossator who had these words suggested to him by the passage here, may easily have written in the margin of li. those two words, and here 'ויש' ש' נ, a subsequent copyist introducing into the body of the text as much as would make sense in each case. There was no reason in either passage why O′ should have objected to the words, if genuine,

while that they can have been omitted by accident in both is very improbable, in view of the independent character of the rendering (see on *v.* 12).

*om. a.* צְבָאוֹת. O′ *vacat.*

17. *η.* אִסְפִּי. Συνήγαγεν, reading אספ׳, and understanding it as אָסְפָה.

*ξ i.* מֵאֶרֶץ. ἔξωθεν. This may be merely a free rendering, but as there are signs that O′ found a difficulty in reading the *v.*, this word as well as others may have been somewhat hard to decipher.

כִּנְעָתֵךְ. τὴν ὑπόστασίν σου, probably expressing the sense fairly well; St Jer. less well *confusionem.*

יֹשֶׁבֶת ק׳. κατοικοῦσα (A pref. ἡ).

(*γ.*) בַּמָּצוֹר. ἐν ἐκλεκτοῖς, as though reading בְּמִבְחָר (see xxii. 7, xlviii. [xxxi.] 15). So also SH. Aq. has ἐν περιοχῇ, Symm. ἐν πολιορκίᾳ, St Jer. *in munitione.* But M.T. may after all have been O′'s reading. See 2 K. [4 K.] iii. 19, where A has (in a conflate reading) ἐκλ. as rendering of that word.

18. *γ.* קוֹלֵעַ. σκελίζω (Aq. Symm. σφενδονήσω). Prob. O′ read צ for ק. The root צלע, *to be lame*, though a somewhat rare one, must have been known to them as occurring Gen. xxxii. 32 [31] (ἐπέσκαζεν). It is also found in the 1st ptcp. Ḳal in Mic. iv. 6, 7 (συντετριμμένην), Zeph. iii. 19 (ἐκπεπιεσμένην). In each place it bears a neuter

signification. In the present case however they seem to have read into the Ḳal a Hiph. sense, or one suggested by צֶלַע, *costa, crus*. St Jer. seems to have found a fut. tense in O′, interpreting *supplantabo*.

*om. d.* הָאָרֶץ בַּפַּעַם הַזֹּאת. τὴν γῆν ταύτην. For omission of 'בפ see following notes.

*ξ i.* וַהֲצֵרוֹתִי לָהֶם. ἐν θλίψει. The MS. was probably only so far legible as to shew to O′ the root of the verb. The subsequent recovery of it however enabled Q[mg], 22, 23, 26, and others (so SH.) to *add* καὶ ἐκθλίψω αὐτούς, while Compl. *substitutes* these words.

*ξ i.* לְמַעַן יִמְצָאוּ. ὅπως εὑρεθῇ ἡ πληγή σου. The sense of the Heb. is obscure, whether with M.T. we take the verb as active, having its object expressed, or with O′ as passive. Perhaps בפעם, accidentally omitted, it would seem, from the text of O′'s Heb. MS. (for the phrase בַּפַּעַם הַזֹּאת gives them no trouble in xvi. 21) was so faintly indicated on the margin that while casting about for something to complete the sense, they were able to read in the word 'מכת (= מכתך), suggested as actually presenting itself to their eyes in the next *v.*, and suitable for the meaning here also (see a somewhat similar case in notes on *v.* 20). Aq. Symm. have ὅπως ἐλεγχθῶσιν, while the words ἡ πλ. σου are wanting in MSS. 23, 86, and in SH. and Compl. St Jer. renders (*tribulabo eos*) *ut inveniantur*.

19. *om.* *c* or *ξ i.* אוֹי־לִי. *οὐαί.* לִי may easily be an insertion suggested by iv. 31, xv. 10, or xlv. 3. O′, if they found the second word at all, read it as though it were לָךְ; and so for the two possessive suffixes (שִׁבְרִי, מַכָּתִי) which follow in this *v.* They were forced to this by not perceiving that the prophet (not the Lord, as in the previous *v.*) is now speaking and identifying himself with his nation. Wo. (p. 140) refers to similar changes of person in xiii. 17, xiv. 17, xlviii. 31. As he points out, personal lamentations on the part of the prophet as a rule do not appear in O′. In defence of their text as the better one in that respect he adds that the formula with which xiv. 17 begins "properly introduces a divine address, and not a human lamentation." But the argument seems to have little force. It is quite easy, with M.T., to take the words עֵינַי etc. as put by the Lord into the prophet's mouth.

*γ.* חֳלִי. *τὸ τραῦμά σου* (A om. *σου*; Q *μου*). M.T. can scarcely be anything but a corruption of חָלְיִי. Aq. Symm. have *ἀρρώστημά μου*, and so Targ., while St Jer. and SH. have the pron. of the 2nd p.

*γ.* וְאֶשָּׂאֶנּוּ. *καὶ κατέλαβέν σε* (AQ *με*), as though וִישָּׂאֲךָ.

20. *ξ i.* אָהֳלִי. *ἡ σκηνή σου* (Q *μου*). See on *v.* 19.

*a c.* שֻׁדַּד. *ἐταλαιπώρησεν, ὤλετο,* a conflate rendering. Ταλ. has already on four occasions (iv. 13, 20 *bis*, ix. 18 [19]) represented the Heb. root, and occurs again (xii. 12). Ὤλετο may have been placed in marg. by one who had in mind its use to render 'שׁ in xlviii. [xxxi.] 1, 15, 18, 20, xlix. [xxx.] 3, 10 [xxix. 11]. St Jer. gives no sign of being acquainted with the doublet.

א* has (for *ὤλετο*) *ᾤχετο,* a verb which is used for 'שׁ in Hos. x. 14.

δ. מֵיתָרַי. *αἱ δέρρεις σου* (Q *μου*). The Heb. word is one which seems to have caused much perplexity to O′ in the Pentateuch. In Ex. xxxv. 18 they omit the whole *v.*; in xxxix. 40 [20] the portion of the *v.* containing 'מי is omitted. In Numb. iii. 26, iv. 26 O′ substitutes a vague generality for the names of articles enumerated. In Numb. iii. 37, iv. 32 they render by *κάλος*, in Is. liv. 2 by *σχοινίσματα*. In the present case it was treated by them as = יְרִיעוֹת, as suggested by the end of the *v.* See on *v.* 18 (last note).

γ. יְצָאֻנִי וְאֵינָם. *καὶ τὰ πρόβατά μου οὐκ εἰσίν* (reading וְצֹאנִי).

γ. נֹטֶה. *τόπος*, reading נָוֶה, which is rendered by *τ.* in xlix. 19 [xxix. 20].

*ξ i.* וּמֵקִים. *τόπος*. The ו may have been swallowed up by the previous י, these two letters being very like each other in MSS.

21. *ξ* (*c*). לֹא הִשְׂכִּילוּ וְכָל־מַרְעִיתָם נָפוֹצָה. *οὐκ ἐνόησεν πᾶσα ἡ νομή, καὶ διεσκορπίσθησαν.* The inaccuracy of rendering may have arisen from obscurity in the writing of the last words. On the other hand Scholz (p. 110) attributes it to an error of ear in dictation.

22. תַּנִּים. *στρουθῶν.* In ix. 10 [11]. li. [xxviii.] 34 (תַּנִּין) תַּנִּים is translated by *δράκων* (so Theod. here), whereas in xlix. 33 [xxx. 11] it is represented as here by *στρ.* This last stands for יַעֲנָה (or בַּת י׳) in Lev. xi. 16 [15]; Deut. xiv. 15 [14], besides Is. xliii. 20; Job xxx. 29.

23. *ξ i.* לֹא־לָאִישׁ הֹלֵךְ וְהָכִין אֶת־צַעֲדוֹ. *οὐδὲ ἀνὴρ πορεύσεται καὶ κατορθώσει πορείαν αὐτοῦ,* freely.

24. *ε bis.* יַסְּרֵנִי. *παίδευσον ἡμᾶς,* reading יַסְּרֵנוּ, and similarly in the last word of the *v.*

*ξ i.* בְּאַפְּךָ. *ἐν θυμῷ.*

25. מִשְׁפָּחוֹת. *γενεάς,* but Q, 22, 23, 36, and others with Compl. and Ald. have *βασιλείας* (probably Midrashic).

*om. d.* וַאֲכָלֻהוּ. O′ *vacat,* doubtless rightly, אכ׳ being obviously superfluous and forming in connexion with the following word a case of *διττογραφία* in M.T.

xi. 2. שִׁמְעוּ...וְדִבַּרְתֶּם. Ἀκούσατε...λαλήσεις. The people as well as Jer. were to hear; he alone was to speak. Hence O′ is probably right in making the second verb sing. The same result may be attained by pointing וְדִבַּרְתָּם. The change of שִׁמְעוּ to the sing. (so Pesh. ܫܡܥ) would be more natural than that O′ and M.T. should conspire, in the case of 'שׁ and 'וד respectively, in turning a sing. to a plural.

6. וּבְחֻצוֹת. καὶ ἔξωθεν. So often, e.g. xliv. [li.] 6, 9, 17, 21; Aq. Theod. καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξόδοις.

7. This *v.* and all but the last clause of the following one are absent from O′. Gi. (p. xxxii) discusses O″s manner of dealing with the passages which occur (in substance) twice in M.T. In about 30 cases (see Kuenen's enumeration[1]) O′ contains them in both places; in seven cases (exclusive of xxxix. 4—10), it omits them in one. Those seven (some however exhibiting much difference of detail) are as follows: (1) *vi.* 13—15 = viii. 10ᵇ—12, (2) *vii.* 24—26 = xi. 7, 8, (3) *xv.* 13, 14 = xvii. 3, 4, (4) *xvi.* 14, 15 = xxiii. 7, 8 (but placed by O′ at the end of the chapter), (5) *xxiv.* 8—10 = xxix. [xxxvi.] 16—18, (6) xxx. [xxxvii.] 10, 11 = *xlvi.* [*xxvi.*] 27, 28, (7) xlviii. [xxxi.] parts of 40, 41 = *xlix.* [*xxix.*] 22. (I have italicized the references where O′ is

[1] *Historisch-kritische Einleitung etc.* Theil II. *Die prophetischen Bücher* (Auth. German transl. by C. Th. Müller), Leipzig, 1892, p. 243, note 11.

found. It may be added that *xxiii.* 5, 6, as compared with xxxiii. [xl.] 15, 16, is yet sufficiently distinct from it to be excluded from this list.) See also on xv. 13.

In (1) Gi. maintains that the connexion in thought appears broken by O′'s insertion, and that it is therefore the earlier passage, not the later, which is the gloss. This however does not seem obvious. In (2) Gi.'s account is that O′, considering that the substance of these *vv.* had already appeared in *v.* 4, omitted them for the sake of shortening. It seems rash, in the absence of better evidence, to assume this. The love of amplification may just as well have led to their insertion in the Heb. at an early date. An inducement to such amplification would be found in the abruptness of the brief historical clause "but they did them not" (*v.* 8) inserted in the account of the message with which the prophet was charged (*vv.* 2 ff.).

13. מִזְבְּחוֹת לַבֹּשֶׁת. O′ *vacat;* an obvious gloss. For comments on use of בֹּשֶׁת as a substitute for בַּעַל, as well as for O′'s use (frequent in Jer.) of the fem. article with the word see Dr Driver's *Samuel*, p. 195.

14. בְּעַד 2°. *ἐν καιρῷ* (בְּעֵת, as at the end of *v.* 12 and in ii. 27, 28).

15. הָרַבִּים. *μὴ εὐχαὶ* (הַנְּדָרִים)...; but very possibly both M.T. and O′'s original represent

corruptions of חֲלָבִים suggested (so Gi.) by Irenæus's words "non enim adipes et carnes pingues auferent a te injustitias tuas."

אָז תַּעֲלֹזִי. *ἢ τούτοις διαφεύξῃ*; reading או תָעֹזִי. It is true that עלז is rendered in xv. 17 by *εὐλαβεῖσθαι*, somewhat kindred in sense to the verb employed here, but the other explanation of O″s reading is more natural. If however the loss of the ל be objected to (but comp. for the loss of a letter such cases as vi. 19 מַחְשְׁבוֹתָם, *ἀποστροφῆς αὐτῶν*, xxii. 22 רֵעָתֵךְ, *τῶν φιλούντων σε*, xlix. 9 [xxix. 10] הִשְׁחִיתוּ, *ἐπιθήσουσιν*) we may conjecture that they saw the root חלץ.

16. פְּרִי. O′ *vacat.* The word is rather suspicious. It does not suit its context, and may have originated in a conjecture for an obscurely written יָפֶה.

הֲמוּלָּה. *περιτομῆς*; as though deriving from מול. The Heb. subst. occurs elsewhere only in Ezek. i. 24, where of the three available chief MSS. B omits (giving the *v.* in a very abbreviated way), while A, and (as an insertion from Theod.) Q, rendering the whole more closely, read הֲמִלָּה (*τοῦ λόγου*).

גְּדֹלָה הִצִּית אֵשׁ עָלֶיהָ. *ἀνήφθη πῦρ ἐπ' αὐτήν* (A *ἐν αὐτῇ*), *μεγάλη ἡ θλίψις ἐπὶ σέ.* Here, as in

the last case but one, conflation seems to have a hand in the reading of O′. Gi. suggests הַצָּרָתָא שֶׁעָלַיִךְ, as the text represented by the second clause of the Greek, while *ἀν. πῦρ* entered the text later as a correction.

19. מַחֲשָׁבֹת. *λογισμόν*, adding *πονηρόν* (Q om. *πον.*; A adds *κατά σου*), *λέγοντες Δεῦτε καί.* These words of O′ are probably (against Gi. p. xxvi) an interpolation, the last part of which may well have been suggested by xviii. 18 (*bis*).

נַשְׁחִיתָה. *ἐμβάλωμεν*; probably reading נָשִׁיתָה. For the loss of ח comp. vi. 19, xlix. 9 [xxix. 10].

בְּלַחְמוֹ, probably (so Cheyne *ad loc.* and others) an early corruption for בְּלֵחוֹ. Comp. for this word Deut. xxxiv. 7. See specially Gen. xxx. 37, Ezek. xvii. 24, xxi. 3, in which three passages the reference, as here, is to wood.

20. אֶת־רִיבִי. *τὸ δικαίωμά μου*; but in xx. 12 *τὰ ἀπολογήματά μου.*

22. הַבַּחוּרִים. *οἱ νεανίσκοι αὐτῶν*; a pretty clear case of somewhat loose translation on O′'s part. It is unlikely, if we consider the subsequent context, that an original בַּחוּרֵיהֶם would have been altered. Here the evidence of a paraphrase like the Targum, quoted by Gi. in favour of the pron. aff., seems scarcely worth reckoning.

23. אַנְשֵׁי. *τοὺς κατοικοῦντας*; although in *v.* 21 *τοὺς ἄνδρας.*

xii. 3. הַתִּקֵם...לְטִבְחָה. O′ *vacat;* probably by an inadvertence, for the words are wanted for parallelism. נתק is a favourite verb with J. (ii. 20, v. 5, vi. 29, x. 20, xxii. 24, xxx. 8). Of MSS. which insert the clause 22, 36 (with ast.), 88, and others (so Theod. SH. with ast.) have *ἄθροισον* (pointing to the reading הַגְרֵם, so translated xviii. 21), while *διασπάω*, *διαρρήγνυμι* and the like are elsewhere O′'s renderings. So Targ. (אַתְקְנִנּוּן), Pesh. (ܟܢܫ), and St Jer. (*congrega*).

4. וְעֵשֶׂב כָּל־הַשָּׂדֶה. *καὶ πᾶς ὁ χόρτος τοῦ ἀγροῦ* (A om. *ὁ* and *τ. α.*). The disagreement as to the place of the adjective suggests that it is an addition. SH. and Pesh. agree with O′.

אֶת־אַחֲרִיתֵנוּ. *ὁδοὺς ἡμῶν* (אֹרְחוֹתֵינוּ). The change from M.T. would be a tempting one, but we can hardly decide with confidence.

5. תְּתַחֲרֶה. *παρασκευάσῃ* (א -*ζῃ*). The only other occurrence of חרה in Taph'el is in xxii. 15, where O′ has *παροξύνῃ*. See note there.

אַתָּה בוֹטֵחַ. *οὐ* (א′A *σου*; Q *σὺ*) *πέποιθας*. O′'s reading was ours, and they did not hesitate to insert a negative (see on ii. 31, xviii. 18). We avoid that necessity, if with Hitzig we read בּוֹרֵחַ.

6. בָּגְדוּ. SH. ascribes to Symm. the rendering *προσδοκᾶν*. Doubtless (see Field) his real reading was *προέδωκαν*, as given in MS. 86 (and 88).

אַחֲרֶיךָ מָלֵא. *ἐκ τῶν ὀπίσω σου ἐπισυνήχθη-σαν.* O′ failed (in spite of success in iv. 5) to see the force of מָלֵא. Vulg. *plena voce.* ܐܬܚܡܡܘ from ܚܡ, *arsit,* given by SH. as Symm.'s interpretation of מלא, was probably due (as pointed out by Bensly; see Field) to a confusion between *ἐνεπρή-σθησαν* and *ἐνεπλήσθησαν.*

9. הַעַיִט צָבוּעַ. *μὴ σπήλαιον ὑαίνης* (A *λη-στῶν*)...; deriving from Arabic roots. There is however no reason to doubt the ordinary rendering of the M.T.

הֵתָיוּ (Hiph. of אתה). *ἐλθέτωσαν* (אA *-θάτ-*); taking it as Ḳal (אֵתָיוּ).

11. שָׂמָהּ. *ἐτέθη* (AQ *ἐγενήθη*); reading שֻׂמָה, pass. ptcp. Targ. Pesh. Vulg. render as though שָׂמֻהָ, with the pl. subject of *v.* 10 understood.

שְׁמָמָה נָשַׁמָּה. *ἀφανισμῷ ἠφανίσθη* (א *ἠφ. ἀφ.*); thus dividing the *v.* differently, and reading שְׁמָמָה.

12. שְׁפָיִם. *διεκβολήν.* See on iii. 2.

שֹׁדְדִים. *ταλαιπωροῦντες.* See on iv. 13.

13. זָרְעוּ...קָצָרוּ. *σπείρατε* (A *ἐσπείρατε*)... *θερίζετε* (AQ *θερίσατε*). The pointing of M.T. is recommended on the whole by the context. The affix of תְּבוּאֹתֵיכֶם, which forms the only objection, is probably an early corruption of the affix of the

3rd p., owing to the verbs having been taken as imperatives. M.T.'s reading is followed by MSS. 22, 33, 41, and others, SH. Vulg. Compl. Ald. This will involve taking בֹּשִׁי as imperative, as does O'.

נְחָלוֹ. *οἱ κλῆροι αὐτῶν.* O' read the root נחל, נַחֲלָה being often (e.g. Gen. xlviii. 6) thus rendered by them. It is remarkable that Aq. (*ἐκληροδοτήθησαν*) and Symm. (*καὶ κληρονομήσετε*) took the same view.

מִתְּבוּאֹתֵיכֶם. *ἀπὸ καυχήσεως ὑμῶν*; reading מִתִּפְאַרְתְּכֶם, a word which O' renders thus on several occasions in Ezek. (xvi. 12, 17, 39, xxiii. 26, 42, xxiv. 25).

מֵחֲרוֹן אַף. *ἀπὸ ὀνειδισμοῦ ἔναντι.* The two Heb. words they seem to have read מֵחֶרְפַּת, and to have inserted *ἔν.* to soften the harshness of the combination of this word with י׳.

14. שְׁכֵנַי. *τῶν γειτόνων.* O' shrunk from this application of the pron., as anthropomorphic. So Gi. See on xxxi. 20.

xiii. 1. תְּבֹאֵהוּ. *διελεύσεται*; a tolerably clear example of a free rendering.

7. טְמַנְתִּיו. *κατώρυξα* (א -*αν*) *αὐτό.* This looks like a mistake (for *κατέκρυψα*) induced by the preceding *ὤρυξα.* SH. has in marg. ܛܫܝܬܗ.

9, 10. הָרָב: הָעָם הַזֶּה. *τὴν πολλὴν ταύτην*

*ὕβριν*; taking the first word as part of *v.* 10, and reading (for הָעָם) הַגָּאוֹן. The fact that thus the adj. preceded its subst. probably gave them but little trouble. SH. follows (but with an ast.) the M.T., which is doubtless right, וִיהִי later in *v.* 10 implying the existence of הָעָם.

10. הָרָע. O′ *vacat.* Probably a marg. gloss, intended to follow לִבָּם, after the analogy of the phrase שׁר׳ לב׳ in five out of its eight occurrences (see note on iii. 17).

הַהֹלְכִים בִּשְׁרִרוּת לִבָּם. O′ *vacat.* Aq. Symm. and SH. (with ast.) recognise the clause, Theod. (and ? Aq.) adding הָרָע. See preceding note.

11. אֶת־כָּל־בֵּית ישׂר׳ וְאֶת־כָּל־בֵּית יה׳. *τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ πᾶν* (א‎[? marg.] *πάντα*; AQ *πάντα τὸν*) *οἶκον Ἰούδα.* Here SH. has preserved to us an indication of the genuine text, by placing *πάντα* also before the first *τὸν οἶ.*, while marking from that *πάντα* to *καὶ* (inclusive) with an asterisk. Thus Judah, as *v.* 9 of itself suggests, is alone spoken of, and M.T. and O′ alike represent a more or less full gloss upon the original Hebrew.

Between this *v.* and *v.* 14 (incl.) there are many traces of slight expansion of the original.

12. נֵבֶל. *ἀσκός.* See on xlviii. 12 for the more accurate rendering *κεράμια* (corrupted to *κέρατα*).

14. וְנִפַּצְתִּים. *καὶ διασκορπιῶ αὐτούς.* This loose rendering of the Heb. root is consequential upon the inaccuracy referred to above.

16. וְשָׁמָּה. *καὶ ἐκεῖ* (וְשָׁמָּה). The affix refers to אוֹר, which is fem. also in Job xxxvi. 32.

17. נַפְשִׁי. *ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν* (thus even Aq.); so later עֵינַי. *οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν.* The M.T. however is preferable, the pron. having perhaps been altered (see *v.* 14 "saith *the Lord*") from fear of anthropomorphism. Comp. other cases in note on xxxi. 20.

וְדָמֹעַ תִּדְמַע. O′ *vacat.* The verb occurs here only. This fact, emphasized by its absences from the similar passages in this context (where, as here, עַיִן, ירד, and דִּמְעָה are combined) may have induced the omission.

נִשְׁבָּה. *συνετρίβη* (נִשְׁבַּר).

18. וְלַגְּבִירָה. *καὶ τοῖς δυναστεύουσιν* (וְלַגְּבוּרָה). The special sense of the word had been forgotten, as is shewn also by O′'s rendering in 1 K. xv. 13 (*ἡγουμένην*); 2 Chr. xv. 16 (apparently *λειτουργοῦσαν*). For a concrete rendering of a noun read by them as an abstract see on xxiv. 5.

מַרְאֲשׁוֹתֵיכֶם. *ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς* (AQ *τῆς κ.*) *ὑμῶν* (מֵרָאשֵׁיכֶם). O′ is probably right, the subst. in M.T. expressing the *place of the head* (as מְרַאֲשׁוֹת

in Gen. xxviii. 11; 1 Sam. xix. 16, xxvi. 7), rather than *the head* itself.

19. הָגְלָת שְׁלוֹמִים. *ἀποικίαν τελείαν.* Read, as in Am. i. 6, גָּלוּת שְׁלֵמָה, the הג׳ of M.T. arising from dittography of the ה of כֻּלָּהּ under the influence of the previous הָגְלָת.

20. עֵינֵיכֶם. (A τοὺς) *ὀφθαλμούς σου.* The M.T. is probably a slip, owing to the plural sense of the reference.

*Ἰερουσαλήμ*; an insertion (suggested by *v.* 27) to explain (so Gi.) the reference in the imperatives. The sing. number doubtless (rather than the Ḳ'ri) represents the original.

21. אַלֻּפִים. *μαθήματα* (A *μαθητάς*); thus giving the Aramaic sense of the root, found once (Prov. xxii. 25) in M.T.

25. מִדַּיִךְ. *τοῦ ἀπειθεῖν ὑμᾶς* (מָרְיֵךְ).

xiv. 3. בֹּשׁוּ...רֹאשָׁם. O′ *vacat;* perhaps an amplification in M.T.; yet, if so, it is strange that so unusual a word as וְהָכְלְמוּ should occur. Thus it is more likely that the eye of the scribe passed accidentally from ריקם to ראשם.

4. בָּאָרֶץ. O′ *vacat.*

6. שְׁפָיִם. *νάπας.* See on iii. 2.

כַּתַּנִּים. O′ *vacat.*

7. מְשׁוּבֹתֵינוּ. *αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἡμῶν.* See on vi. 19.

לָךְ. *ἐναντίον σοῦ, ὅτι* (Q om. *ὅτι*) *σοί. ἐναν. σου*, a marg. gloss, demanded, when it entered the text, the introduction of *ὅτι* for the sense.

8. וּכְאֹרֵחַ. *καὶ ὡς αὐτόχθων* (וּכְאֶזְרָח).

9. נִדְהָם. *ὑπνῶν* (נִרְדָּם).

10. וְיִפְקֹד חַטֹּאתָם. O′ *vacat* (Aq. Theod. *καὶ ἐπισκέψεται ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν*). The clauses וַיהוָה...חַטֹּאתָם are found in Hos. viii. 13.

13. אֲהָהּ. Ὁ *ὤν.* See on i. 6.

2° לָכֶם. *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καί*; apparently suggested by *v.* 15.

14. (ק׳) וְתַרְמִית. *καὶ προαιρέσεις.* See on viii. 5.

15. בַּחֶרֶב וּבָרָעָב יִתַּמּוּ. Ἐν *θανάτῳ νοσερῷ ἀποθανοῦνται καὶ ἐν λιμῷ συντελεσθήσονται.* Aq. Theod. have (for the whole of the above) *ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ λιμῷ τελευτήσουσιν.* The first four words of O′ are apparently taken from xvi. 4 (מְמוֹתֵי תַחֲלֻאִים יָמֻתוּ), while, whether owing to their insertion or not, the Greek for בַּחֶרֶב, which is doubtless genuine, disappeared early.

16. יִהְיוּ. *καὶ ἔσονται* (וְהָיוּ, easily corrupted in such a context).

17. עֵינַי. *ἐπ'* (Q *ἐπὶ τοὺς*) *ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν*. See on x. 19 for change of person.

בְּתוּלַת בַּת־עַמִּי. For other instances of this construction see on v. 24.

18. גַּם־נָבִיא גַּם־כֹּהֵן. *ἱερεὺς καὶ προφήτης*. For the inversion of order see on vi. 13.

סָחֲרוּ. The notion of wandering to and fro, or trading, which belongs to this verb (e.g. Gen. xxxiv. 10, 21) seems here inappropriate. Hence Gi. suggests that we substitute ש for ס (for שחר see on ii. 18), taking the root in the sense of sinking (to the earth) in mourning garb.

19. גָּעֲלָה. *ἀπέστη*. See on xxxi. [xxxviii.] 32.

קַוֵּה. *ὑπεμείναμεν*; thus rendering more successfully than in viii. 15.

בְּעָתָה. *ταραχή*. See on viii. 15.

21. אַל־תְּנַבֵּל. *μὴ ἀπολέσῃς*. Gi. (p. xx) suggests with some probability that this rendering was influenced by the meaning of the somewhat similar root חבל. It is remarkable on the other hand that the verb חבל (which does not however happen to occur in Jer.) is never so rendered by O'. Thus it is after all very possible that O' here read אַל־תְּאַבֵּד.

xv. 1. אֶל־הָעָם הַזֶּה. *πρὸς αὐτούς*. Spohn's

conjecture (*ad loc.*) that the words *τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον* were removed from this place (*αὐτοὺς* being substituted) and were inserted in the next clause, so that Moses and Samuel should become the objects of the preposition, involves a most improbable procedure on the part of an early editor or copyist. On the other hand if we take O''s reading, as above, to be the genuine one, then a Heb. copyist, hesitating to admit that such persons as M. and S. could under any circumstances fail to obtain a hearing, would most naturally place his emendation (אל ה׳ ה׳) in the margin. The words, which may well have been in the actual MS. used by the translator, met with varying treatment. In the Greek version they were made to belong to the later clause, while in the Heb., as represented by M.T., they took the place of an original אֲלֵיהֶם.

6. נִלְאֵיתִי הִנָּחֵם. *καὶ οὐκέτι ἀνήσω αὐτούς*; reading הַנִּחֵם (נוח), perhaps from fear of anthropomorphism. The Vulg. is remarkably inaccurate, *laboravi rogans*.

7. הָאָרֶץ. *λαοῦ μου*. Throughout the rest of the *v.* also the rendering of O' is exceedingly loose.

מִדַּרְכֵיהֶם לוֹא שָׁבוּ. *διὰ τὰς κακίας αὐτῶν*; very freely.

8. עִיר וּבֶהָלוֹת. *τρόμον καὶ σπουδήν*. So in

R.V. "anguish and terrors," correcting A.V. "terrors upon the city." For עִיר see on xlvii. 7, and for בה׳ on viii. 15.

10. נָשׁוּ, נָשִׁיתִי. ὠφέλησα, ὠφέλησεν (Vulg. *foeneravi, foeneravit*), a corruption as early as Philo (who however reads -σαν, *De Confus. Ling.* § 12 of the Tauchnitz ed., i. 411 of Mangey's, London, 1742. See Dr Ryle's *Philo*, p. 298 f.), for ὠφείλησα, -σεν, the verb, which renders נ׳ in Deut. xv. 2; Is. xxiv. 2. Origen (*in Jerem. Hom.* xi. 3, § 3) says that the majority of the MSS. have ὠφέλ. but the most accurate and most in accord with the Heb. ὠφειλ.

כֻּלֹּה (כֻּלּוֹ ק׳) מְקַלְלַוְנִי. (So Baer and Delitzsch.) ἡ ἰσχύς μου ἐξέλιπεν ἐν τοῖς καταρωμένοις με. See viii. 6, xx. 7 for the unwillingness of O′ to put an affix to כֹּל. Here they read כָּלָה, while for the nom. which they supply see next note. As regards מק׳, a form so anomalous grammatically is extremely suspicious. Therefore we should probably read (with Gi.) כֻּלָּהֶם קִלְלוּנִי.

11. אמר י׳. The almost invariable form (xlvi. 25 is the only exception) is כה א׳ י׳. We trace its existence here (as Gi. points out) in O′'s ἡ ἰσχύς μου (כֹּחִי) in the last clause of *v.* 10.

אָמַר. γένοιτο (אָמֵן).

אִם־לֹא שֵׁרִיתִךָ ק׳ (שרותך כ׳). κατευθυνόντων αὐτῶν. We can scarcely determine O′'s

reading of the word 'שׁר. אִם־לֹא they probably took to be a strong asseveration. Vulg. has "si non reliquiae tuae (in bonum)," understanding the word as שְׁאֵרִיתְךָ = שֵׁרִיתְךָ. So Targ. with Aq., but Pesh. has ܐܢ ܠܐ ܫܪܝܬܟ. The 'כ is doubtful in sense, שֵׁרוּתְךָ or שֵׁרוּתְךָ, *thy deliverance*, from שרה, or שָׁרוֹתִךָ, *I have been hostile to thee*, from צרר = שרר. There has probably been considerable corruption in the *v.* One of the two expressions introduced by בְּעֵת may well have stood earlier, while with O' לְטוֹב comes immediately before אֶת־הָאֹיֵב.

12. הֲיָרֹעַ. *εἰ γνωσθήσεται*; reading ד for ר. It is remarkable that the Vulg. *Numquid foederabitur?* is supported by Aq. (*μὴ ἁρμόσει;*), who thus would read the word הֲיֵרָעַ, fut. Niph. of רעה. O' evidently were hopelessly confused over the *v.* They omit one בַּרְזֶל, read apparently צִפּוּי (which in Numb. xvii. 3, 4 [xvi. 38, 39] they render *περίθεμα*) for 'מצ, and end the sentence with the first word of *v.* 13.

13. The text of the parallel passage, xvii. 3, affords help towards emendation.

לֹא בִמְחִיר. *ἀντάλλαγμα*. The parallel text preserves the genuine בְּמוֹתֶיךָ (without לֹא). The

early corruption of this word involved the prefixing of a negative; so Aq. Targ. Vulg. ("gratis").

וּבְכָל־חַטֹּאותֶיךָ (ק') . *διὰ πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου.* It is not needful to assume that בְּחַטָּאת of xvii. 3 was the original reading here also. As Gi. points out, all the versions agree so far as בְּחַטֹּאותֶיךָ. The conjunction and the כָּל doubtless are accretions, to which accordingly the testimony outside M.T. and O′ is more slender.

The *v.* is an important one, as bearing on the treatment of duplicate passages by O′. See on xi. 7. In the seven cases there enumerated in which such duplicates appear but once in O′, it is always (taking O′'s order) on the *second* occasion that the passage is lacking. This seems hardly the result of accident. It is open to us to suppose that O′ omitted either (*a*) because on each of the second occasions the passage was unknown to them, or (*b*) because they saw no need of giving it a second time. But against (*a*) we have just seen that the present passage is pretty clearly genuine in its second occurrence (xvii. 3), and hereby therefore disposes us in favour of (*b*). We are thus left free in these cases to consider on its merits the M.T. of both the earlier and later passage. Further, the corruption of a text such as this (whether we regard it as a very early interpolation from xvii. 3, or as a genuine part of the

Book,) in despite of the neighbourhood of the uncorrupted text, testifies alike to the carelessness of the Book's guardians during some portion of its sojourn in Egypt, and to the faithfulness, even though not wholly according to knowledge, of the Greek translators in refusing to make the obvious change suggested by the parallel passage.

14. וְהַעֲבַרְתִּי. *καὶ καταδουλώσω σε.* Here, as in xvii. 4, the ד should be restored. Possibly a contracted mode of writing may account for the absence of the pron. affix which appears in the parallel place. In the later part of the *v.* it seems rash in the face of so many instances in which a verb occurs in the same voice with a trans. and an intrans. meaning, to assume with Gi. on the strength of Deut. xxxii. 22 that קָדְחָה should be used to correct אֵשׁ קְדַחְתֶּם in the parallel *v.*

15. אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ. O′ *vacat.* It is hard to suppose that they would have omitted words so simple and obvious in their relation with the context. May they not be a gloss, intended as a melancholy comment in the light of history on the לֹא יָדָעְתָּ of *v.* 14? תִּקָּחֵנִי on the other hand may easily be a case where O′ omits from perplexity as to the sense of the clause.

16. נִמְצָאוּ. *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀθετούντων*; reading מְנַאֲצַי. Comp. 1 Sam. ii. 17. See Wo.'s somewhat

unconvincing defence (p. 259) of O′'s rendering of this *v.*

וְאֲכַלֵּם. *συντέλεσον αὐτούς* (כַּלֵּם).

17. וָאֶעְלֹז. *ἀλλὰ εὐλαβούμην.* It is noteworthy that while O′ also mistook this verb in xi. 15 (*διαφεύξῃ*), and li. [xxviii.] 39 (*καρωθῶσιν*), they were more successful in l. [xxvii.] 11 (*κατεκαυχᾶσθε*).

18. כְּאֵבִי. *οἱ λυποῦντές με* (כֹּאֲבַי).

נֶצַח. *κατισχύουσίν μου* (נִצְּחוּ). Comp. the rendering of this word in viii. 5.

אֲנוּשָׁה. *στερεά.* The Heb. was evidently unfamiliar to O′. Their attempt here however is good in comparison with that in xvii. 9.

xvi. 1, 2. O′ omits *v.* 1, but inserts in 2 [1] (after *γυναῖκα*) *λέγει Κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ.* Thus with them the prophecy has the air of a fragment, of which the commencement has been lost, and which was subsequently altered for the sake of harmonizing with the form of M.T.

4. לְדֹמֶן. *εἰς παράδειγμα.* See on viii. 2.

*πεσοῦνται* suggests that יִפְּלוּ either formed part of the original text, or more probably was a marg. variant for יִכְלוּ.

5. נְאֻם....הָרַחֲמִים. O′ *vacat.* The Heb. is clearly an addition by way of comment on the unusual expression אם את ש׳.

7. לָהֶם. *ἄρτος* (לֶחֶם); rightly, as both the parallelism and Is. lviii. 7 shew. St Jer. seems to have read both ("inter eos...panem") and certainly the former words improve the sense. See Schwally, *Leben nach dem Tode*, Giessen, 1892, p. 22, quoted by Cor. (p. 58). The corruption in M.T. might arise through the influence of the repeated לָהֶם in *v.* 6.

עַל־אֵבֶל. *ἐν πένθει αὐτῶν*. The pron. which M.T. attaches to the next word points rather to the reading אֶל־אָבֵל, to the existence of which however the Vulg. ("lugenti") alone testifies.

לְנַחֲמוֹ. *εἰς παράκλησιν*; thus rightly omitting the pronoun.

אוֹתָם. *αὐτόν*; probably rightly. The corruption in the Heb. would be a natural result of that of לחם in the previous clause.

12. שְׁרִרוּת. *τῶν ἀρεστῶν* (A *ἐρασ.*). See on iii. 17.

13. יוֹמָם וָלַיְלָה. O′ *vacat.*

14, 15. See on xi. 7, xv. 13, xxiii. 7, 8. Cor. (p. 65) considers the verses to form an authentic passage, but to be absolutely inappropriate here. For his proposal with regard to them see on xxxiii. 14—26.

17. לֹא נִסְתְּרוּ מִלְּפָנָי. O′ *vacat.*

18. רִאשׁוֹנָה מִשְׁנֵה. *διὰ πάσας*, but $B^{ab}$ℵAQ

διπλᾶς. The first Heb. word seems to have been inserted in reference to the promise of *vv.* 14, 15. The second *may* be a reminiscence of Is. xl. 2, although the expression there is כִּפְלַיִם.

מָלְאוּ. ἐπλημμέλησαν, a very possible corruption for ἔπλησαν. See the latter verb in xix. 4.

19. אַךְ־שֶׁקֶר. Ὡς ψευδῆ (כְּשֶׁקֶר); an example of O′'s tendency to disregard a weak letter like א. See on vii. 10.

xvii. 1, 2. O′ *vacat.* St Jer.'s suggestion (*Comm. in loco*) that the Greek translators omitted the passage "ne scilicet aeterna in eos sententia permaneret" may well be accepted as correct. But see next note.

3, 4. O′ *vacat.* See on xv. 13, 14. Cor. however (p. 59) thinks it probable that the omission of verses 1—4 here was caused by the scribe's eye wandering from יהוה of xvi. 21 to the same word in xvii. 5.

4. וְשָׁמַטְתָּה וּבְךָ. Perles[1] (p. 41) mentions the conjectural emendation וְשָׁמַטְתָּ חוֹבְךָ, which is ingenious, but leaves the meaning rather forced. No such objection attaches to his (p. 40) excellent הנהיתה instead of הן היתה in ii. 10.

5. וְשָׂם בָּשָׂר זְרֹעוֹ. καὶ στηρίσει σάρκα βραχίονος αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτόν. This rendering indicates a

[1] *Analecten z. Text-critik d. A. T.*, Munich, 1895.

certain lack of intelligence. They read בְּשֵׁר and referred it to the man who looks to another as more powerful, whereas the word clearly refers to the latter. Hence they had to insert ἐπ' αὐτὸν for the sake of the sense. Wo.'s defence of O''s text (p. 87) is unsatisfactory.

8. יִרְאֶה ק'. φοβηθήσεται; following יְרָא כ', and rightly, as the parallel יִרְאָה shews. ק' is an adaptation to *v.* 6. So Vulg. *timebit.*

9. עָקֹב. βαθεῖα (א βοηθία; MSS. 22, 36, and others βαρεῖα). Vulg. has "pravum."

וֶאֱנָשׁ. καὶ ἄνθρωπος. So in *v.* 16 and Is. xvii. 11. For another rendering see on xv. 18.

11. קֹרֵא. ἐφώνησεν πέρδιξ; a conflate rendering. So Pesh. Rabbinic interpreters incline to the meaning *heron.* Gi. is unwilling to decide, rendering simply "ein Vogel."

The parallelism of the *v.* supports Gi.'s interpretation of the sentence. 'He that acquireth riches, but not by right, is a bird that guardeth those which she hath not borne (hatched).' In Wo.'s discussion of the passage (p. 254) he seems to see no difficulty in his assumption of the loss of one קרא from the Heb. text.

12. מֵרִאשׁוֹן מְקוֹם. O' *vacat,* owing probably to homoioteleuton. It is difficult to conceive the words to have been inserted as an expansion of the

Heb. They were read by Aq. Symm. SH. Pesh. Vulg. ("a principio, locus").

13. וְסוּרַי (ק׳) בָּאָרֶץ יִכָּתֵבוּ. ἀφεστηκότες (סוּרֵי ?) ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς γραφήτωσαν. We want וְסוּרֶיךָ, and the Vulg. (Clem.) has indeed *recedentes a te*, but Cod. Amiat. omits *a te*. Ewald (quoted by Cor. p. 68) emends to וְסוּרֶיךָ, and continues בא׳ יִכָּלֵמוּ, thus getting rid of an awkward figure, and at the same time improving the parallelism.

מַיִם־חַיִּים. πηγὴν ζωῆς. The omission of ὕδατος (found in the rendering of the same words in ii. 13) can only be ascribed to an early error. The corresponding Heb. word is essential to the passage.

16. לֹא־אַצְתִּי מֵרֹעֶה אַחֲרֶיךָ. οὐκ ἐκοπίασα κατακολουθῶν ὀπίσω σου. O''s Heb. seems to have been the same as ours. Puzzled however by מרעה אח׳, but perhaps understanding it in the sense of *feeding after thee*, i.e. *following thee as a sheep its shepherd*, they rendered somewhat loosely. On the other hand, if we point מֵרָעָה, we improve the parallelism of the *v.* So Aq. Pesh. Aq. renders אַצְתִּי ἐκραταίωσα (אִמַּצְתִּי ?).

17. מַחְסִי. φειδόμενός μου; taking it to be from the root חוס.

20. שִׁמְעוּ. O' *vacat*, but B[ab(marg.)]אA have ἀκούσατε.

21. וְהֵבֵאתֶם. *καὶ μὴ ἐκπορεύεσθε.* This appears to be a very early corruption, although there is no variant surviving. It evidently arose from some confusion with the similar collocation of words in *v.* 27. The same verb is rendered by *εἰσφέρειν* in *v.* 24. So here the Compl. has *εἰσφέρητε.*

23. *ὑπὲρ τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν*; an addition suggested by vii. 26. See however Wo. (p. 81) for another view.

24. אִם־שָׁמֹעַ תִּשְׁמְעוּן. *ἐὰν εἰσακούσητε* (A *ἀκούσ.*; Q *ἀκοῇ ἀκούσ.*). The שָׁמֹעַ, when viewed in the light of the facts commented upon in the note on iii. 1, would appear not to have been found by O′ in their Heb. text. Deut. xxviii. 1 or Zech. vi. 15 may have suggested its insertion here.

25. וְשָׂרִים. *καὶ ἄρχοντες*; interesting as a virtually certain example of a pre-septuagintal insertion in the Heb. text. Its spuriousness is shewn by וְשָׂרֵיהֶם which follows. It has been suggested by parallel passages (ii. 26, xxv. 18, xxxii. 32, xliv. 17, 21), but has not been inserted in xiii. 13, xxii. 4.

26. וְזֶבַח וּמִנְחָה. *καὶ θυσίαν καὶ θυμιάματα καὶ μάννα.* The first two substantives give us a conflate rendering. 'ז, although translated *θυμ.* 1 S. ii. 29, iii. 14; 2 K. x. 24 (in A), is yet ordinarily represented by *θυσ.*, which accordingly found its

way into the text. *Μάννα* is meant as a transliteration of the Heb. (comp. viii. 7). St Jer. however (*Comm. in loco*) corrects the spelling to *μαναά*. So here and in xli. [xlviii.] 5 MSS. 22, 33, and others.

27. אַרְמְנוֹת. *ἄμφοδα*. See on vi. 5.

xviii. 2. אַשְׁמִיעֲךָ. *ἀκούσῃ*. It is noteworthy that while the Vulg. has *audies*, the Pesh. on the other hand follows M.T. O′ however may have read the word as we do. Comp. in iv. 5 הַשְׁמִיעוּ, *ἀκουσθήτω*, and similarly in iv. 15. In Deut. iv. 10; 1 Sam. ix. 27 the Hiph. of this verb is similarly rendered. Comp. xix. 9.

4. בַּחֹמֶר בְּיַד הַיּוֹצֵר. *ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ*; reading בְּיָדָיו, doubtless rightly. בי׳ ה׳ was an explanatory gloss, and its admission to the text drew with it, through the influence of the wording of *v.* 6, the addition of כַּחֹמֶר, which however Baer and Del. (see their *Adnot. crit. ad loc.*) read, as above, בַּחֹמֶר. So Aq. Theod. Vulg. ("e luto").

הַיּוֹצֵר. *αὐτοῦ*. See preceding note. The tendency to amplification in this context is specially illustrated in *vv.* 6, 8.

7. וְלִנְתוֹץ. O′ *vacat*. See on i. 10.

8. אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתִּי עָלָיו. O′ *vacat*. The clause was inserted for the sake of parallelism. So Gi.

12. נוֹאָשׁ. *ἀνδριούμεθα.* See on ii. 25.

מַחְשְׁבוֹתֵינוּ. For comment on O′'s rendering see on vi. 19.

שְׁרִרוּת. See on iii. 17.

14. The point of the *v.* seems to be to contrast the steadfastness of the snow and the springs of water with the fickleness of the people. Its obscurity however has caused much perplexity to translators. מִצּוּר שָׂדָי. *ἀπὸ πέτρας μαστοί* (שָׁדַיִם), which Wo. (p. 261) renders "(Shall) protuberances (depart) from rocks?" an explanation however which appears to stagger even so uncompromising a defender of O′'s text. See Field for Aq. *ἀπὸ στερεοῦ ἱκανοῦ* (שַׁדַּי, *the Almighty*); Symm. *πέτρας μαστῶν* (so Pesh.). Cor.'s suggestions (p. 50) שִׂרְיֹן and הַיָּזוּב are good. See his whole note.

אִם־יִנָּתְשׁוּ. *μὴ ἐκκλινεῖ* (א *ἐκκλίνῃ*); reading יִנָּשְׁתוּ, a root found in this sense in Is. xix. 5.

מַיִם זָרִים קָרִים נוֹזְלִים. *ὕδωρ βιαίως ἀνέμῳ φερόμενον.* For זָרִים (supported by Aq. Symm. Pesh.) זֵדִים (*proud*, occurring in xliii. 2) is one conjecture. Again in favour of considering O′ to have read צ for ז is the fact that צָר is rendered similarly by them in Is. lix. 19. For the other

words they appear to have read קָדִים and נֹזְלִים (זלל). Best of all however is Perles' view (*l.c.* p. 29) that O' read זרמ׳ and understood it as a contracted form of זְרָמִים. (He compares for a somewhat similar mistake Ps. xi. 6 פַּחִים for פַּחֲמֵי.) The Targ. accordingly here, as he points out, renders נָחֲתִין, translating in Ps. lxxvii. 18 זֹרְמוּ מַיִם by אֲחִיתוּ מַיָא. See further in his note.

Cor. (p. 50) ventures to restore מ׳ ז׳ ק׳ to מַיִם אַחֲרוֹן מַיִם. He compares for יָם אח׳ (the Mediterranean) Deut. xi. 24 and other passages, in all of which however the words have the article.

15. וַיַּכְשִׁלוּם. *καὶ ἀσθενήσουσιν* (וַיִּכָּשְׁלוּ). So Symm. omits the suffix, as well as Pesh. and Vulg. ("impingentes").

17. עֹרֶף וְלֹא־פָנִים אַרְאֵם בְּיוֹם אֵידָם. *δείξω αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν* (אֶרְאֵם יוֹם) *ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν.* The first words of the Heb. are unlikely to be an insertion from xxxii. 33, inasmuch as there they refer to the people, here to God. O' therefore probably omitted them as anthropomorphic. The reading of אראם as Ḳal changed the construction of יום from an accus. case to an abl. of time and hence induced the prefixing of ב.

18. וְאַל־נַקְשִׁיבָה. *καὶ ἀκουσόμεθα.* Gi., al-

though no blind defender of O′, thinks that here they may be right, the clause then meaning *Let us take hold of his words.* It is however more than doubtful whether usage will warrant any other meaning than *hearken* in a favourable sense. For the variants caused by O′'s insertion or omission of the negative see references given on ii. 31; see also on iv. 1, xxiii. 32, xxxi. 37, xxxvi. 25, xlix. 21, li. 3, 58.

19. לְקוֹל יְרִיבָי. *τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ δικαιώματός μου.* The parallelism of the clauses supports O′. The first י of 'יר may easily have arisen as an accidental addition to the preceding word.

20. כָּרוּ שׁוּחָה. *συνελάλησαν ῥήματα* (deriving 'שׁ from שִׂיחַ); a Midrashic rendering (for O′'s treatment of שׁוּחָה in this Book see on ii. 6), which is followed by an alternative gloss (arising from disapproval of the extreme freedom of that rendering), viz. *καὶ τὴν κόλασιν αὐτῶν ἔκρυψάν μοι.* Its form may have been suggested by the last words of *v.* 22. Gi. (*ad loc.*; see also his p. xxv) goes so far as to make the Heb. clause itself a later addition, pointing out that in *v.* 22 it is differently rendered (*ἐνεχείρησαν λόγον*). Wo.'s defence of O′ as it stands (p. 87) is quite inconclusive.

21. וְהַגִּרֵם. *καὶ ἄθροισον αὐτούς*; as though it were וְהַאֲגִרֵם. For this treatment of א see on vii. 10, xliii. 2.

23. וְיִהְיוּ (ק׳) מֻכְשָׁלִים. *γενέσθω ἡ ἀσθένεια αὐτῶν*; reading מִכְשֹׁלִים.

xix. 2. גֵּיא. *τὸ πολυάνδριον.* See on ii. 23.

בֶּן־הִנֹּם. *υἱῶν τῶν τέκνων αὐτῶν*; reading (so Wo.) בְּנֵי־נִינָם.

3. *καὶ ἄνδρες Ἰούδα* was suggested by xvii. 20, while *καὶ οἱ εἰσπ....ταύταις* was suggested by xvii. 20 or by xxii. 2. Conversely, for a similar insertion in M.T. comp. vii. 2 with note.

4. וּמָלְאוּ. *ἔπλησαν.* The conjunction has crept in, owing to וּמַלְכֵי being taken as part of the preceding enumeration, and not as the subject of this verb.

5—7. Comp. notes on vii. 31—33. There is also a strong resemblance between *v.* 5 and xxxii. [xxxix.] 35.

5. עֹלוֹת לַבָּעַל. O′ *vacat.* For לב׳ xxxii. 35 has לַמֹּלֶךְ. עֹל׳ is not elsewhere used in reference to the worship of Molech. This fact supports O′ here.

וְלֹא דִבַּרְתִּי. O′ *vacat* (AQ *οὐδὲ ἐλάλησα*). The words do not occur in vii. 31.

וְלֹא...לִבִּי. *οὐδὲ διενοήθην ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου.* See on vii. 31.

7. וּבַקֹּתִי. *καὶ σφάξω* (Q *κ. κατασφάξω*); a

strange rendering, if genuine. St Jer. makes no comment, translating *Et dissipabo*. Spohn conjectures *σπαράξω* as O′'s original rendering, pointing out that they represent the Heb. verb in Nah. ii. 3 (comp. *v.* 11) by *ἐκτινάσσειν*.

8. וְשַׂמְתִּי. *καὶ κατάξω*; so Bא, but AQ have *καὶ τάξω*, of which the other is a corruption.

יִשֹּׁם. *σκυθρωπάσει*. So in l. [xxvii.] 13.

9. וְהַאֲכַלְתִּים. *καὶ ἔδονται*. For the rendering, as though of Ḳal, comp. note on xviii. 2.

ומב׳ נפ׳. O′ *vacat*. The words are probably repeated from *v*. 7. The expression is a frequent one in this Book (xxi. 7, etc.).

11. לְהֵרָפֵה. See on iii. 22.

וּבְתֹפֶת...לִקְבּוֹר. O′ *vacat*. The absence of connexion shews the clause to be an insertion borrowed in substance from vii. 32.

12. וְלָתֵת. *τοῦ δοθῆναι*. The ו is an accidental repetition of the previous letter.

13. הַטְּמֵאִים. *ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν αὐτῶν*. In M.T. הט׳ must refer *attributively* to בָּתֵּי. But we want it as a predicate. If for this purpose we attach the ה to the end of the previous word, thus reading, as in Is. xxx. 33, תָּפְתֶּה, the objection remains that טמ׳ should occur earlier in the *v*., whereas O′ bears testimony at least to the present

*position* of the word. Cor. therefore, who argues (p. 69) as above, and Gi. decide (though the former somewhat doubtfully) for הַטְּמֵא (agreeing with מְקוֹם).

וְהִסֵּךְ. *καὶ ἔσπεισαν*, reading, as in xxxii. [xxxix.] 29, וְהִסְּכוּ.

xx. 2. וַיַּכֶּה פ׳ אֵת יר׳ הנ׳. *καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτόν* (וַיַּכֵּהוּ; comp. xxvi. 23).

בִּנְיָמִן. *οἴκου ἀποτεταγμένου*. According to Gi. O′ read the word as though בֵּתְמִין. At any rate they connected the last part with the root מנה.

3. וַיְהִי מִמָּחֳרָת. O′ *vacat*.

מָגוֹר מִסָּבִיב. *Μέτοικον*; taking the other meaning of the root גור. It is remarkable that while Aq. (see St Jer. *ad loc.*) did the same in his 2nd ed. ("peregrinum"), in his 1st ed. he strangely took it as "circumspicientem."

4. לְמָגוֹר. *εἰς μετοικίαν*. See previous note.

וְאֶת־כָּל־יְהוּדָה. *καὶ σὲ καὶ πάντα* Ἰούδα; reading (not the startling Heb. which J. F. Schleusner adopts from Cappellus וְאַתְּ וְכָל, but) וְאֹתְךָ וְאֶת־כָּל, the accidental repetition of the four letters bringing about the loss of one of the groups.

בְּבָלָה. O′ *vacat.*

5. וְאֶת־כָּל־יְקָרָהּ. O′ *vacat.*

וּבְזָזוּם וּלְקָחוּם. O′ *vacat.* Aq. Symm. have the words.

6. פַּשְׁחוּר. O′ *vacat.*

תָּבֹא וְשָׁם. O′ *vacat.*

7. כֻּלֹּה. *διετέλεσα*; refusing to accept the combination of כל with a pronoun. See on viii. 6, xv. 10.

8. מִדֵּי אֲדַבֵּר אֶזְעָק. *πικρῷ λόγῳ μου* (מַרֵי) (דָּבָר) *γελάσομαι*; taking the verb in the sense of צחק.

וָשֹׁד. *καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν.* See on iv. 13.

וּלְקֶלֶס. *καὶ χλευασμόν* (א *εἰς χλεύασμα,* AQ *εἰς -μόν*). So א^c.a ART in Ps. xliv. [xliii.] 14. קֶלֶס is not found outside the two passages, קַלָּסָה (*ἐμπαιγμός*) occurring Ezek. xxii. 4.

9. לֹא־אֶזְכְּרֶנּוּ. *Οὐ μὴ ὀνομάσω* (Q ins. *ἔτι*) *τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου*; Midrashic.

בְּלִבִּי. O′ *vacat.*

עָצֻר. *φλέγον*; MSS. 23, 26, and others *φλεγόμενον* and so SH. A conflate rendering is given by MSS. 22, 36, and others, *φλεγόμενον καὶ συνεχόμενον.*

כַּלְכַּל. *πάντοθεν*; as though from כֹּל.

וְלֹא אוּכָל. *καὶ οὐ δύναμαι φέρειν.*

10. מָגוֹר. *συναθροιζομένων.* They seem to connect with the unused אגר, *to bind, collect.*

הַגִּידוּ וְנַגִּידֶנּוּ. Ἐπισυστῆτε καὶ ἐπισυστῶμεν. The root suggested to them גְּדוּד, *a troop.* Comp. *σύστρεμμα* as their rendering of this last word in 2 Sam. iv. 2; 1 K. xi. 24 (in A). This seems much preferable to Gi.'s view (p. xxii), that they may have seen the root גור.

צַלְעִי. *τὴν ἐπίνοιαν αὐτοῦ*; apparently to be explained as a very free rendering. The subst. *ἐπ.* does not occur elsewhere in the O.T., except in the Apocryphal Books. The verb *ἐπινοεῖν* renders שׂוּם in Job iv. 18.

11. יִכָּשְׁלוּ וְלֹא יֻכָלוּ. *καὶ νοῆσαι οὐκ ἠδύναντο*; reading וְשַׂכֵּל לֹא י׳, through the influence of the following הִשְׂכִּילוּ. For a misreading produced by a neighbouring influence of this kind see note on lii. 21 (נָבוּב, *κύκλῳ*). So we may explain Is. xxxiv. 14, where *ὀνοκένταυροι*, used to render אִיִּים, represents also לִילִית in the next line.

16. יְהוָֹה. O′ adds *ἐν θυμῷ.*

17. מֵרֶחֶם. *ἐν μήτρᾳ* (AQ add *μητρός*). ב and מ were easily confused. See on iii. 4. See also xiv. 19 (בְּצִיּוֹן, *ἀπὸ Σιών*), xvi. 4 (מְמוֹתֵי, *ἐν θανάτῳ*),

xxv. 9 (וְהַחֲרַמְתִּים, *καὶ ἐξερημώσω αὐτούς*), xxxviii. [xlv.] 24 (בַּדְּבָרִים, *ἐκ τῶν λόγων*), xlvi. [xxvi.] 10 (בְּאֶרֶץ, *ἀπὸ γῆς*), 25 (מִנֹּא, *τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς*), xlviii. [xxxi.] 32 (בִּבְכִי, *ὡς κλαυθμόν*), li. [xxviii.] 20 (בְּךָ, *ἐκ σοῦ*), lii. 12 (עָמַד, עָבַד).

18. לָמָּה זֶּה. *ἵνα τί τοῦτο.* The readiness to translate so very Hebraic an idiom may serve to indicate the vitality of Heb. turns of language among even the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria.

xxi. 2. נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר. O′ *vacat.*

3. צִדְקִיָּהוּ. O′ adds *βασιλέα* Ἰούδα (Q *om.*); not so Targ. Vulg. SH. The Pesh. has simply ܡܠܟܐ.

4. אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. O′ *vacat,* while Aq. Symm. Theod. have the words. Symm. has the words אֲשֶׁר בְּיֶדְכֶם, which follow.

אֶת־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל וְ. O′ *vacat.* Aq. Symm. Theod. have the words.

וְאָסַפְתִּי אוֹתָם. O′ *vacat.* Symm. has the words. Of these four groups of words it is specially unlikely that the last would have been omitted by O′, had they found it in their Heb. text. Again, if we admit the second and third to be later insertions in M.T., the *v.* read without these additions, brings מֵסֵב sufficiently near to אֶל־תּ׳ to avoid any suspicious harshness.

5. חֲזָקָה. *κραταιῷ*. But א* prefixes *ὑψηλῷ*, and so text of SH. St Jer. (in *Comm.*) has "forti" but adds "sive excelso." O′ renders by *ὑψ.* in Exod. vi. 1, xxxii. 11, but almost everywhere else has *κρατ.* or *ἰσχυρός*.

וּבְחֵמָה. O′ *vacat* (AQ *in fine καὶ παροργισμοῦ μεγάλου*).

7. וְאֶת־הנש׳. O′ *om.* ו. The omission makes the language to harmonize better with such passages as viii. 3, xxiv. 8.

בְּיַד נבו׳ מ׳ ב׳ ו. O′ *vacat;* an insertion from one of the following, xxvii. 36, xxxii. 28, xliv. 30 (in xxix. 21 נבו׳ is probably a gloss).

וּבְיַד 2°. O′ *vacat;* against the testimony of similar expressions, e.g. xix. 7.

וְהִכָּם *καὶ κατακόψουσιν αὐτούς* (וְהִכּוּם).

לֹא־יָחוּס. *οὐ φείσομαι.* As Gi. points out, O′ having read the previous verb in the pl., would have here read the existing M.T. in the same number. Thus they must have had אָחוּס וגו׳, readings which are supported by xiii. 14. The corruption in the Heb. was obviously induced by reading וְהִכָּם, a change which itself arose from the intrusion of בְּיַד נבו׳ וגו׳. See above.

9. וּבַדָּבֶר. O′ *vacat;* a frequent insertion. See on xxxviii. [xlv.] 2.

יְחִיֶה (כ׳). *ζήσεται.*

לְשָׁלָל. *εἰς σκῦλα*; adding *καὶ ζήσεται* (וָחָי) from xxxviii. [xlv.] 2.

10. נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה. O′ *vacat.*

11. In the first clause understand תֹּאמַר from *v.* 8. The construction baffled O′. See p. 5, note 2.

12. וְהַצִּילוּ. *καὶ κατευθύνατε, καὶ ἐξέλεσθε.* It is unlikely, in the face of the parallel passage, xxii. 3, that such a word as וְהַצְלִיחוּ has fallen out of the text. Rather, *καὶ κατ.* is a gloss on the words which follow.

תֵּצֵא. *ἀναφθῇ*; reading תֻּצַּת. Comp. ix. 11 [12], xi. 16, xvii. 27, l. [xxvii.] 32.

מִפְּנֵי ר׳ מ׳. O′ *vacat;* an insertion from iv. 4, with which קְרִי here agrees.

13. צוּר. *Σόρ.* The word has been very variously translated (Aq. 1st ed.? *στερεά*, 2nd ed. *Τύρος*, Symm. *πέτρα*, Theod. *συνεχομένη*), probably owing in part to the obscurity of the reference. In xviii. 14 O′ seems to have had no difficulty in rendering by *πέτρα.*

יֵחַת. *πτοήσει*; so Vulg. *percutiet*, taking it as Hiph. from חתת instead of Ḳal from נחת.

14. וּפָקַדְתִּי...יְהוָֹה. O′ *vacat.*

xxii. 1. רֵד. *Πορεύου καὶ κατάβηθι*; probably

a combination of the original and an amended rendering.

2. וַעֲבָדֶיךָ. *καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου.* ℵ[c.a vid] prefixes *καὶ οἱ παῖδες*, and Q replaces *ὁ οἶ.* by *οἱ π.* Thus *π.* was probably the original word, with *οἶ.* substituted. Cheyne (*Pulpit Comm. ad loc.*) however (from whose note it is not gathered that the combination "and thy servants and thy house" is at the best extremely doubtful) connects the *οἶ.* with that of xxi. 11, 12.

4. הוּא וגו׳. *αὐτοὶ* (ℵ* *αὐτοῦ*) *κτλ.* So Vulg. The pl. was suggested by xvii. 25, where see note.

5. תִּשְׁמְעוּ. *ποιήσητε*; through the influence of this verb in *v.* 4.

6. (כ׳) נוֹשָׁבָה. *κατοικηθησομένας* (נוֹשָׁבוּ ק׳). Mich. conjectures עֲרִיָּה, *a bare floor* (for עָרִים) in support of כ׳.

7. וְקִדַּשְׁתִּי. *καὶ ἐπάξω* (A *εἰσ.*); Midrashic. MSS. 22, 48, and others have *κ. ἁγιάσω*; so text of SH. In li. [xxviii.] 28 a different account (see note there) is probably to be given of the rendering of קד׳.

10. לְמֵת. *τὸν τεθνηκότα.* The passage xvi. 5 ff. seems responsible for M.T.'s omission of the article, which is here clearly wanted, as referring to Josiah.

12. הִגְלוּ. *μετῴκισα* (Q *-σαν*); so Vulg. *transtuli.* The Greek is however probably an early error for *-σαν*, which was read by SH. (So Compl.)

13. הוֹי. O′ *vacat* (AQ ὦ). Ω followed by OO might easily fall out. It is however very possible, as Perles says (*l.c.* p. 17), that O′ may have read ה׳ בונה as הַבּוֹנֶה.

14. הָאֹמֵר אֶבְנֶה. ᾠκοδόμησας. The repeated change of persons in this and the next *v.*, though consonant with Heb. idiom, is reduced by O′ to uniformity (ᾠκοδ.....μὴ βασιλεύσεις;).

15. מְתַחְרֶה. παροξύνῃ (Q παρωξύνθης). See on xii. 5. Here, as in that passage, the verb needs an object. Accordingly we must make the clause end with אָבִיךָ.

בָּאֶרֶז. ἐν 'Αχάζ, but A has 'Αχαάβ (and so Arabic. Comp. 1 K. xxii. 39), as though reading באחאב. Cor. (p. 62) suggests that this was written without the second א (comp. *v.* 23 נִחֲנְתְּ), and then was corrupted through בָּאֶרֶז of *v.* 14. In the remainder of this *v.* and in the next O′ evidently were hopelessly at fault.

16. οὐκ ἔγνωσαν at the beginning looks like the translation of a marg. Heb. gloss on the last clause of the *v.* Why should the words which Gi. conjectures as their "viell. ursprünglich" original, viz. לֹא יָדַע, have been lost?

17. אֵין עֵינֶיךָ וְלִבְּךָ. οὐκ εἰσὶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου οὐδὲ ἡ καρδία σου. O′ adds καλή, thus injuring the force of the sentence.

מְרוּצָה. *φόνον.* SH. read *πόνον.* Vulg. has *cursum.* Comp. the Greek in xxiii. 10.

18. יְהוּדָה. O′ adds Καὶ (AQ Οὐαὶ) *ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον.*

וְהוֹי אָחוֹת. O′ *vacat.*

וְהוֹי הוֹדֹה (כ׳). O′ *vacat.* The word does not suit the parallelism. The variants (e.g. A om. *οὐδὲ... κύριε*; Q adds to *κύρ., καὶ οἴμοι ἀδελφέ*) indicate a deep-seated corruption. SH. places an ast. before *οὐ (μὴ) κόψ.* The most probable account is as follows. As אָחוֹת is not likely to be an insertion, and as O′ would naturally feel a difficulty in understanding its application, they seem to have decided to cut the knot by omitting the second member of each division of the lament. This was the easier, if the last member (see above) had by their time become corrupt. See further on xxxiv. 5.

20. מֵעֲבָרִים. *εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης*; reading מֵעֵבֶר יָם. It is remarkable that in Numb. xxxiii. 44 they render, as here, by *πέραν*, while there, in *vv.* 47, 48, they transliterate (*ἀβαρίμ*).

21. בְּשַׁלְוֹתַיִךְ. *ἐν τῇ παραπτώσει σου*, and so SH. ܒܡܫܪܥܘܬܟܝ. But the sense is undoubtedly as Aq. Symm. *ἐν τῇ εὐθηνίᾳ σου*; so Vulg. *abundantia.*

22. רֹעַיִךְ. *τοὺς ποιμένας σου.* Aq. Symm. (*ἑταίρους*) read רֵעַיִךְ. Vulg. has *pastores tuos*, but St Jer. suggests "amatores sive amici tui."

רֵעֶתָךְ. *τῶν φιλούντων σε*; as if רֵעֶיךָ were repeated here.

23\. נֵחַנְתְּ. *καταστενάξεις* (נֶאֱנַחְתִּי), Vulg. *congemuisti.* The omission of the א (ננחתי) led to the transposition of the נ and ח, and thus to the connecting of the word with חנן ("How gracious etc." A.V.).

24\. יִהְיֶה. *γενόμενος γένηται.* See on iii. 1. "The expression of a condition is often emphasized by the addition of the infin. abs." Driver, *Samuel etc.* Note on i. 11. A *doubtful* example (see note there) of the Heb. idiom, which O' thus preserves, is to be found in xvii. 24; not so Exod. xv. 26; Deut. xi. 13. For other instances see Gi. here, or Driver on 1 S. xx. 6.

25\. וּבְיַד 1°. O' *vacat.*

וּבְיַד נבו׳ מ׳ ב׳ ו. O' *vacat* (Aq. Theod. *hab.*). Gi. would also reject וּבְיַד הַכַּשְׂדִּים.

26\. עַל־הָאָרֶץ אַחֶרֶת. *εἰς γῆν.* The grammar of the M.T. is dubious. Probably therefore אַחֶרֶת entered the text before the article, which was inserted to harmonize with עַל הא׳ of *v. 27.* Aq. Theod., while adding *ἑτέραν*, leave the *γῆν* anarthrous; and so SH.

27\. לָשׁוּב שָׁם. O' *vacat.*

28\. הַעֶצֶב נִבְזֶה נָפוּץ הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה כָּנְיָהוּ. *ἠτι-*

μώθη Ἰεχονίας. הע׳ probably perplexed O′, while the three words following נב׳ entered the text later.

מַדּוּעַ. ὅτι. So in xxvi. [xxxiii.] 9.

29. אֶרֶץ. O′ *vacat*. Comp. vii. 4.

30. This *v.* serves to illustrate more than one interesting point connected with the double text, viz. the tendency of M.T. to insert stock phrases, while yet it is unsafe to explain thus *all* O′'s "omissions"; and again, the weakness in grammar shewn here and there by the translators, although on the other hand they were prepared to deal with a difficulty suggested by the *subject-matter*.

כֹּה אָמַר יה׳. O′ *vacat*.

עֲרִירִי גֶּבֶר. ἐκκήρυκτον ἄνθρωπον. "Childless," as the natural sense of the Heb. adj., must have been familiar to O′ from Gen. xv. 2 etc. But Jechonias appears to have had children according to 1 Chr. iii. 17 ff. Hence they gave the Midrashic rendering, *proscribed*, *banished*. Further, despite the order of the Heb. words, they connected them thus, as though reading ג׳ ע׳.

לֹא־יִצְלַח בְּיָמָיו. O′ *vacat*. Had גֶּבֶר also (see last note) been absent from their text, we might have taken the clause ג׳ ל׳ יצ׳ ב׳ as an insertion, although (against Wo. p. 33) it much improves the balance of the sentence. As things stand however, it seems best to assume that the later words of the clause are genuine. The recurrence of לא־יצ׳ might

easily lead to the omission of those words by O′. Comp. the omission in xxiii. 2.

xxiii. 1. מַרְעִיתִי. τῆς νομῆς αὐτῶν (AQ μου); reading מרעית׳, and understanding it as תָם—.

2. הָרֹעִים 2°. O′ *vacat*. See end of note on xxii. 30.

3. צֹאנִי. τοῦ λαοῦ μου; Midrashic.

מִכֹּל. ἐπὶ πάσης (but ℵAQ ἀπό).

4. וְלֹא יִפָּקֵדוּ. O′ *vacat*.

5, 6 are very similar to xxxiii. [xl.] 15, 16, where O′ is lacking. See note on xi. 7.

6. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל. καὶ Ἰσραήλ, but ℵ has κ. Ἱερουσαλήμ. The יְרוּשָׁלַםִ of the parallel passage xxxiii. 16 should probably be restored here. Cheyne (*ad loc.*) considers that xxxii. 30, 32, li. 49; Zeph. iii. 14 (in that passage O′ supports him) afford parallels. See further his reference to Grätz's illustration from Zech. i. 19.

אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרְאוֹ יְהוָֹה צִדְקֵנוּ. ὃ καλέσει αὐτὸν Κύριος Ἰωσεδέκ. ℵ* Ἰωσεικεὶμ seems to be a trace of a misreading of the pron. suff. Here successive applications to individual leading men may well have caused varieties of reading. Ἰωσεδέκ (יְהוֹצָדָק) is mentioned Hag. i. 1 etc.; Zech. vi. 11; Ezra iii. 2 etc.; Neh. xii. [xxii.] 26. At the same time it is unsafe to assume that the translators would have

thought it needful to transliterate the suffix of 'צ. Their σεδὲκ may therefore represent צִדְקֵנוּ. The virtual duplication of יהוה in the Greek (K. being the subject of the preceding verb) suggests that the passage had been tampered with even before the time of O′.

It is of course possible that the name of God may not have originally entered at all into the proper name placed in apposition with the suff. in יִקְרְאוֹ, and may only have come into it through the accidental presence of the preceding יהוה. See Wo.'s defence of this view in his discussion of the passage, pp. 239 ff. We cannot however let pass unchallenged his statement that "even the Massoretic accentuation seems to shew clearly that 'Jehovah' belongs to the word preceding." The accent is indeed in form identical with one of the Distinctives (לְגַרְמֵיהּ), but in accordance with the somewhat intricate laws of Heb. accentuation must here be virtually a Conjunctive, פָּזֵק by name, whose function is to divide words, which, though connected in sense, "it might nevertheless seem desirable, for the sake of effect in the reading, to separate by a slight pause[1]." Thus it is plain that

[1] Wickes, *Treatise on the Accentuation of the twenty-one so-called Prose Books of the O. T.*, Oxford, 1887, p. 120. See further on his pages following, and contrast the functions of לְגַרְמֵיהּ as given pp. 22, 119.

the accentuation, whatever its authority may be worth, is in favour of connecting 'צ '׳.

7, 8. O′ *vacat*, but the *vv.* appear after *v.* 40 with slight variations (on which see Cor.'s note on xxxiii. 14—26, p. 65), this discrepancy in their position falling in with the supposition of their spuriousness in this place. See also on xi. 7, xv. 13.

9. שִׁכּוֹר. *συντετριμμένος*; reading שָׁבוּר.

דִּבְרֵי קָדְשׁוֹ. *εὐπρεπείας δόξης αὐτοῦ.* They seem to have read (for 'ד) הֲדַר. Their Heb. MS. was perhaps blurred. Nowhere else does *δόξα* represent 'ק. The nearest parallel is נִקְדַּשׁ, *δοξασθήσεται*, Is. v. 16.

10. כִּי מְנָאֲפִים מָלְאָה הָאָרֶץ. O′ *vacat.* There can be little doubt (against Gi.) that one or other of the two clauses of the *v.*, which end in 'הא, is spurious. To the absence of the first of these from O′'s text may be added the fact that it bears a sufficient similarity to the second to justify us in conjecturing it to be a gloss on a blurred text, and suggested by *v.* 14. Further, this harmonizes with the logical connexion of the whole passage, in which, if we follow O′ as our guide, the iniquities of the prophets and priests become gradually more clearly indicated, till they are at last definitely specified in the last sentence (*v.* 14).

אָלָה. *τούτων* (אֵלֶּה); quite justifiably. See

last note. That the familiar rule "Proclivi lectioni praestat ardua" by no means always applies in such cases is illustrated by *v.* 17. See note there on לְמ׳ ד׳.

נָאוֹת. See on ix. 9 [10].

מְרוּצָתָם. *ὁ δρυμὸς* (but ℵAQ *δρόμος*) *αὐτῶν.*

לֹא־כֵן. *οὕτως* (AQ *οὐχ οὕτως*). See on viii. 6.

14. יְדֵי מְרֵעִים. *χειρῶν πολλῶν* (AQ *πονηρῶν*); dividing the words after the מ and reading the latter part as רַבִּים.

לְבִלְתִּי שָׁבוּ. *τοῦ μὴ ἀποστραφῆναι.* To make the Heb. grammatical we must alter to שׁוּב (or יָשֻׁבוּ).

15. See on ix. 14 [15].

16. הַנִּבְּאִים לָכֶם. O′ *vacat.* הַנִּבְּאִים הַנִּבְּאִים presented no difficulty to O′ in *v.* 25. We may therefore consider that the second word was absent from their text here.

17. אֹמְרִים אָמוֹר. *λέγουσιν* (Aq. Symm. add *λέγοντες*). This, as being a case the converse of those enumerated in note on iii. 1, makes it plain that the idiom, while surviving among the Alexandrian Jews, had ceased to have any real significance to their ears. Compare note on *v.* 39.

לִמְנַאֲצַי דִּבֶּר יְהוָֹה. *τοῖς ἀπωθουμένοις τὸν λόγον* (לִמְנַאֲצֵי דְּבַר) *Κυρίου*; much more smoothly.

וְכֹל הֹלֵךְ בִּשְׁרִרוּת לִבּוֹ. *καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς πορευομένοις τοῖς θελήμασιν αὐτῶν, παντὶ τῷ* (Q *om. τῷ*) *πορευομένῳ πλανῇ καρδίας αὐτοῦ* (ℵ* *-τῶν*); by conflation. For *πλ.* as rendering of 'שר see on iii. 17.

18. בְּסוֹד. *ἐν ὑποστήματι.* The nearest parallel to this rendering is the *ὑπόστασις* of *v.* 22. On the other hand in vi. 11 we have *συναγωγή* and in xv. 17 *συνέδριον.*

וַיִּשְׁמַע. O′ *vacat;* obviously an insertion for the sake of smoothness.

דְּבָרוֹ ק׳, דְּבָרַי (דְּבָרִי?) כ׳. O′ *vacat.* MS. 88 and SH. agree with 'כ.

20. תִּתְבּוֹנְנוּ בָהּ בִּינָה. *νοήσουσιν αὐτό* (AQ *αὐτά*); reading 'התב. Comp. xxx. 24.

22. מִדַּרְכָּם הָרָע ו. O′ *vacat;* inserted for the sake of improving the parallelism. Ezek. xiii. 22 may have suggested it.

23. O′ makes this *v.* an affirmation, not a question; and rightly. God, as universally present, can never be at a distance. Such is the thought of *v.* 24. But later the *v.* was made interrog. in order to meet the difficulty presented by the later Jewish conception, viz. that God dwelt wholly apart from men. So Gi. M.T. however is followed by St Jer.

26. תַּרְמִית. *τὰ θελήματα.* See on viii. 5.

27. אֶת־עַמִּי. O′ *vacat.*

שְׁמִי 1°. *τοῦ νόμου μου*; either an early error of ear, or a marg. gloss on 'שׁ.

28. נְאֻם־יְהוָה. (29) *Οὕτως οἱ λόγοι μου, λέγει Κύριος.* O' is to be preferred. A slight confusion in M.T. has carried כֹּה into the next *v.*

29. הֲלֹא. *οὐκ ἰδού* (א *οὐχί*; AQ *οὐχ*) seems a double rendering, *ἰδ.* being the original one.

31. הַלֹּקְחִים לְשׁוֹנָם. אAQ have *τοὺς ἐκβάλλοντας προφητείας* (A *-τείαν*) *γλώσσης* (A *-σσῃ*). This and *v.* 30 are lacking in B. The expression puzzled the translators. They therefore gave a conjectural rendering, which can only be paralleled by that in Job xxii. 22 קַח־נָא מִפִּיו תּוֹרָה. *ἔκβαλε* (but not so אA) *δὲ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξηγορίαν.*

וַיִּנְאֲמוּ נְאֻם. אAQ have *καὶ νυστάζοντας νυσταγμὸν ἑαυτῶν* (Q *αὐτῶν*). They connected the words with נום.

32. עַל־נִבְּאֵי חֲלֹמוֹת שֶׁקֶר. *πρὸς τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς προφητεύοντας ἐνύπνια ψευδῆ* (A *ψ. ἐν.*). Cor. (p. 62) considers an original הַנְּבִיאִים to have been omitted from the Heb. text, not accidentally, but by way of support to the idea (see note on xxix. 8) that "dreams...are entirely outside the province of all prophecy, whether false or true."

וַיְסַפְּרוּם. *καὶ οὐ διηγοῦντο αὐτά*; but אAQ

omit οὐ. For O′'s treatment of the negative see on xviii. 18.

33. אוֹ־הַנָּבִיא אוֹ־כֹהֵן. ἢ ἱερεὺς ἢ προφήτης (א ὁ πρ.). See on vi. 13.

אֶת־מַה־מַּשָּׂא. Ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ λῆμμα; rightly dividing אַתֶּם הַמַּשָּׂא. SH. attributes to Aq. (and so in Zech. ix. 1) the rendering ἄρμα (ܡܪ̈ܟܒܬܐ) instead of ἆρμα, to which St Jer. testifies.

36. תִזְכְּרוּ. ὀνομάζετε (Q -ζητε); reading תַזְכִּרוּ. Comp. the Hiph. as rendered in Josh. xxiii. 7; Is. xix. 17, xxvi. 13; Am. vi. 10.

וַהֲפַכְתֶּם...אֱלֹהֵינוּ. O′ *vacat*; a later addition, as the accumulation of epithets suggests.

37. 1° כֹּה...יְהוָה. O′ *vacat* (Q *hab.*); probably an insertion suggested by *v.* 35. The additional epithets of God in the Greek of *vv.* 37, 38 point however to corruptions in O′ as well.

38. וְאִם...תֹּאמֵרוּ. O′ *vacat.*

39. וְנָשִׁיתִי אֶתְכֶם נָשֹׁא. ἐγὼ λαμβάνω (נָשָׂאתִי). O′ is clearly right, on account of the מַשָּׂא, which is the prevailing word in the passage. An original נשתי was wrongly ascribed to the root נשה, and the י inserted accordingly. It is remarkable that although O′ were quite willing to represent, as far as might be done in Greek, the usage by which the finite verb is emphasized by an infin. abs., even

when the Heb. text contained nothing to justify such representation (see instances on iii. 1), they yet were also not unwilling to ignore the idiom, when it did appear. Comp. note on *v.* 17.

מֵעַל־פְּנֵי. O′ *vacat* (Q *hab.*); inserted from vii. 15.

For O′'s insertion of *vv.* 7, 8 at the end of this chap. see on *v.* 7.

xxiv. 1. וְאֶת־הַמַּסְגֵּר. *καὶ τοὺς δεσμώτας* (א* om.); as though reading מַסְגֵּר. The Heb. word occurs elsewhere in xxix. [xxxvi.] 2 (where O′ has δ. *καὶ τεχνίτου*); 2 K. xxiv. 14, 16 (*τὸν συγκλείοντα*); Is. xxiv. 22 (*ὀχύρωμα*), xlii. 7 (*δεσμῶν*); Ps. cxlii. [cxli.] 8 (*φυλακῆς*).

3. See on i. 11.

5. אֶת־גָּלוּת יְהוּדָה. *τοὺς ἀποικισθέντας Ἰουδαίους* (אAQ *Ἰούδα*). For the tendency to substitute the concrete for the abstract comp. vii. 32 (הַהֲרֵגָה), 34, xiii. 18, xix. 34, xxx. [xxxvii.] 19, xlvii. [xxix.] 7, xlviii. [xxxi.] 3.

6. הַזֹּאת. O′ adds *εἰς ἀγαθὰ* (Q om.) from the previous clause.

8. כִּי. O′ *vacat.*

9. לְרָעָה. O′ *vacat;* a gloss on לזעוה, or "merely a dittogram" (Cor. p. 61).

לִשְׁנִינָה. *εἰς μῖσος*; as though לְשִׂנְאָה. Yet in

Deut. xxviii. 37; 2 Chr. vii. 20 they render διήγημα, and in 1 K. ix. 7 λάλημα.

10. וְלַאֲבוֹתֵיהֶם. O′ *vacat;* perhaps an insertion from 2 Chr. vi. 25.

xxv. See Cor. (pp. 53 f.) for the extensive changes adopted by him in the main from Schwally (*Zeitschrift d. A. T. Wissenschaft*, viii. 177—190).

1. הִיא...בָּבֶל. O′ *vacat* (Q *hab.*); a gloss.

2. יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא. O′ *vacat;* a gloss consequential on the preceding.

(2°) כָּל־. O′ *vacat.*

3. מִן. Ἐν. It is not likely that ב would here have been altered to מִן, and as this preposition is written in full, the case differs from the simple confusion of letters dealt with in note on xx. 17.

אָמוֹן. Ἀμώς. See on i. 2.

הָיָה...אֵלַי. O′ *vacat;* taken from i. 2.

וְלֹא שְׁמַעְתֶּם. O′ *vacat;* an insertion from such passages as vii. 13.

4. וְשָׁלַח יְהוָה. καὶ ἀπέστελλον. This *v.* breaks the connexion, is unsuitable in its Greek form to the mouth of Jeremiah, as referring to past generations of prophets, and is therefore an interpolation in both texts. That the Greek gives

us the older form is shewn by (*a*) its coincidence with the language of vii. 25 f. (comp. xi. 7 f.) from which it is taken, (*b*) the absence of notification of a change of subject. M.T. seeks to remove this harshness, and, in doing so, alters the construction from that of 'ו conversive,' as though indicating a date when that construction was at least obsolescent.

אֶת־כָּל־עֲבָדָיו. *τοὺς δούλους μου.* See previous note.

5. לֵאמֹר is a harsh construction, as the passage now stands, but not so (see note on *v.* 4) if joined to *v.* 3 (when ולא שׁ׳ is there omitted).

נָתַן יְהוָֹה. *ἔδωκα*; by way of harmonizing with their form of the previous *v.* This is a clear indication (against Wo.) that O′ were not in the habit of firmly adhering to the Heb. text before them when they saw what appeared to them to be an adequate reason for change.

6. אוֹתִי. *με.* Here the change by way of harmonizing affects both texts. The Heb. was originally את י׳ (=אֶת־יְהוָֹה).

וְלֹא אָרַע לָכֶם. *τοῦ κακῶσαι ὑμᾶς.* Here the harmonizing is confined to the Heb., O′ giving us the rendering of לְרַע לָכֶם, which strangely enough has only survived in its Heb. shape in the gloss forming the greater part of *v.* 7.

7. נְאֻם יְהוָה. O′ *vacat*. The words were inserted through failure to perceive that the preceding אֵלַי referred to the prophet, and that it was consequently connected with *v.* 3.

לְמַעַן ... לָכֶם. O′ *vacat;* a gloss, suggested by the similar language of *v.* 6.

9. אֶת־כָּל־מִשְׁפְּחוֹת. πατριάν (אAQΓ prefix τήν). πᾶσαν must have fallen out, as is shewn by the subsequent pl. suffix.

נְאֻם...עַבְדִּי. O′ *vacat;* an obvious gloss. Observe the harshness of the construction of אֶל. For O′'s non-recognition of this title of Neb. in M.T. see on xxvii. 6 [xxxiv. 5], xliii. [l.] 10, and Wo. pp. 243 f.

הָאֵלֶּה. O′ *vacat;* a gloss.

וְהַחֲרַמְתִּים. καὶ (A om. καὶ) ἐξερημώσω αὐτούς; reading ב for מ. For other instances of this confusion see on xx. 17.

וּלְחָרְבוֹת. καὶ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν; as though reading וּלְחֶרְפַּת. It is remarkable however that the Hiph. of חרב is thus rendered in six instances.

10. קוֹל רֵחַיִם. ὀσμὴν μύρου. We can hardly imagine the Greek to be original. ר׳ in the sense of millstones must have been sufficiently familiar

to the translators through Exod. xi. 5; Deut. xxiv. 6, where they have *μύλον*. But the fact that רֵיחַ in its ordinary sense of *odour* was rendered generally by *ὀσμή*, coupled with the corruption of *μύλου* into *μύρου*, easy where the context seemed to suggest it, would lead to marg. glosses, in time taking the place of the text.

11. וְעָבְדוּ הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה אֶת־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל. *καὶ δουλεύσουσιν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.* Here and in *v.* 12 O′ preserves for us the original Heb. They read בַּגּוֹיִם, but failed to understand the meaning of 'ע when constructed thus, viz. *to make to serve.* (Comp. xxxiv. 9.) The sense of the clause is that 'the families of the north' shall bring the Jews and the peoples who border upon their land into bondage. Later the Heb. copyist, failing also to perceive this sense, changed 'בג into 'הג, a change which, providing 'ע with a subject, left it without an object. In order to supply one 'אֶת־מ' ב was inserted.

12. עַל־מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל וְ. O′ *vacat.* When, owing to the misunderstanding of *v.* 11, עָבְדוּ had changed its subject, the reference of הַגּוֹי הַהוּא was no longer clear. Hence the addition 'עַל־מ' ב, and later in the *v.*, of וְעַל־אֶרֶץ כַּשְׂדִּים.

נְאֻם יְהוָֹה אֶת־עֲוֹנָם. O′ *vacat* (AQ *φησὶν Κύριος*).

וְעַל אֶרֶץ כַּשְׂדִּים. O′ *vacat.* See last note but one.

13 [14]. אֲשֶׁר־נִבָּא יִרְמְיָהוּ עַל־כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם. ἃ ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἰερεμίας ἐπὶ τὰ (א* *om.* τὰ) ἔθνη. Thereupon follows τὰ Αἰλάμ, Q adding ἐν ἀρχῇ βασιλέως Σεδεκίου βασιλέως Ἰούδα λέγων, all this now standing in xlix. 34 of M.T., and there forming the heading of one of the prophecies against foreign nations. See the discussion which follows as to the position of those prophecies.

14. O′ *vacat.* See following discussion.

At this point occurs the most marked discrepancy as to order between the two texts. Here follow in O′ the prophecies against foreign nations, while in M.T. they form chaps. xlvi.—li. Also the prophecies are quite differently grouped in the two texts.

Thus two distinct questions present themselves:

1°. Are we to prefer the position which O′ assigns to the prophecies as a whole?

2°. Are we to prefer O′'s grouping?

To the first question we are disposed to answer, Yes; to the second, No.

1. In favour of the position which they occupy in O′ are the following considerations:

(*a*) It is unlikely that the words "which J. hath prophesied etc." (end of *v.* 13) should be from the prophet himself. The most natural account of this clause is that it formed, as it now forms in O′, the heading of the collection of prophecies against foreign nations, and therefore that these had their place here (as in Isaiah and Ezekiel) and not at the

end of the Book. When Heb. editors of the text removed them to the end, the clause in question was by mistake left behind (comp. the converse proceeding pointed out in the note on li. 64), and considered to be the conclusion of the preceding sentence.

(*b*) *v.* 14 implies such a removal, for it can only be reasonably explained as an editorial comment (otherwise O′ would have it) afterwards inserted for the sake of smoothness.

(*c*) We should *a priori* expect the prophecies to appear in the company of the kindred matter which here follows (*vv.* 15—38).

(*d*) O′'s general respect for their Heb. text and scrupulousness in dealing with it (see p. 5) does not accord with the supposition that they made so striking a change.

On the other hand against O′'s text may be pleaded:

(*a*) It is not unnatural that the earlier and later portions of this chapter should be thus divided.

(*b*) That by the Greek arrangement the passing of sentence upon the nations (*vv.* 15—38 [xxxii. 1—24]) is made to follow (whereas it should naturally precede) the announcement of punishments as set forth in detail in the prophecies themselves.

Neither of these arguments seems very weighty as against the probabilities on the other side. They are both mentioned by Gi. (p. xxxiii), who however, following Kuenen (*l. c.* p. 218) and Orelli

(*Kurzgef. Comm.* iv. 217) is inclined for a third position, viz. immediately after chap. xxv. But in the absence of clearer evidence than these authorities can adduce, we may well hesitate to suppose that the prophecies have been displaced in both texts.

2. Taking now the second of the above questions, we consider the *grouping* of the prophecies.

It may prove convenient to exhibit in parallel columns (*a*) the grouping in M.T., (*b*) that in O′, (*c*) the order adopted in the somewhat imperfect summary found in xxv. 19—26[1].

| (*a*) M.T. xlvi.—li. | (*b*) O′ [xxv. 14—xxxi.] | (*c*) M.T. *vv.* 19—26. |
|---|---|---|
| 2 Egypt | 8 Elam | Egypt |
| 4 Phil. | 1 Egypt | [Uz (near Idum. & Eg.)] |
| 9 Moab | 9 Bab. | Phil. |
| 6 Ammon | 2 Phil. | Edom |
| 5 Edom | 5 Edom | Moab |
| 8 Damascus | 4 Ammon | Ammon |
| 7 Kedar and Hazor | 7 K. and H. | Tyre and Sidon |
| 1 Elam | 6 Damascus | "the islands" |
| 3 Bab. | 3 Moab | [Arabia and] "mingled people" |
| | | [Zimri] |
| | | Elam |
| | | Medes |

It is obvious that columns (*a*) and (*c*) are in close correspondence as regards order, especially

[1] The figure prefixed to each name in the columns (*a*) and (*b*) refers to the position occupied by the name in (*b*) and (*a*) respectively. In column (*c*) [ ] indicate that the name is lacking in O′.

when we eliminate the names in [ ]. It is also clear that the names, as gathered from *vv.* 19—26, given in (*c*), were not liable to any such regrouping as might befall the prophecies themselves. In favour of that order there is thus (*a*) a strong presumption to start with, (*b*) the fact that Egypt is the most natural country, with which to begin such an enumeration, inasmuch as it was "the nation whose overthrow by Nebuchadnezzar would be the signal to the rest of a similar fate[1]."

(*c*) If we regard the geographical position of the places mentioned, it is plain that there is no comparison between the orderly arrangement of the M.T. and the confusion exhibited by the grouping in O′.

We therefore conclude in favour of the M.T. in this respect. It is hard in fact to believe that the prophecies originally standing (if the results of the first part of our discussion be admitted) immediately before xxv. 15, were in anything resembling O′'s present order. If we put the further question, Why then was the alteration made? it is true that we can obtain no very satisfactory reply. We may

[1] *Camb. Bible for Schools and Colleges, Jer. and Lam.* p. 184. Wo. (p. 113) objects to this statement on the ground that the prophecy "would not necessarily be so understood, until after the events predicted had transpired (sic)." But surely a prophecy uttered in such close connexion with the victory at Carchemish, might well have suggested this thought either to the prophet himself or to those who first collected his prophecies.

with Kuenen[1] consider that it was in part caused by the historical point of view belonging to the time of the translators. We may on the other hand (to take the two most striking examples of the displacement in O′) suppose that the position of Elam (a short prophecy of six *vv.*, as compared with the twenty-six *vv.* to which Egypt, thus displaced, extends) may be merely the result of so slight a consideration as the available amount of room at the end of a roll, while again the large space still occupied by Babylon in the Jewish mind might easily suggest a much earlier position in the sequence.

We must however remember in any conjectural answers to this question that after all the word *alteration* may be an unsuitable one. O′'s disorder conceivably arose simply because the prophecies existed in Egypt in a more or less detached form, and were put together without conscious reference to the grouping in any copies of the collective works of Jeremiah.

[1] *l. c.* p. 218, note 14. "Als der griechische Übersetzer lebte, war Persien—welches zwar nicht mit Elam identisch ist, aber doch daran angrenzt—von den Griechen unterworfen; es ist nicht unwahrscheinlich, dass der Übersetzer—oder der Besitzer der Handschrift, welcher er folgte—darin eine Erfüllung der Prophetie des Jeremia sah, und sie deshalb als höchst beachtenswert voranstellte. Aus denselben oder ähnlichen Gründen kann er den Weissagungen wider Egypten und wider Babel den zweiten und dritten Platz angewiesen haben, während er die übrigen in der Reihenfolge aufnahm, in der sie ihm in die Hände oder vor die Augen kamen."

xxv. 15 [xxxii. 1]. הַחֵמָה. τοῦ ἀκράτου (הַחֶמֶר). חמר is rendered thus in Ps. lxxv. [lxxiv.] 9.

אוֹתוֹ. O′ *vacat.* The object, as being evident, was not expressed, or it may have been included in the verb, then to be read וְהִשְׁקִיתָהּ.

16 [xxxii. 2]. וְשָׁתוּ. O′ *vacat* (AQ[a] καὶ πίονται); a gloss.

וְהִתְגֹּעֲשׁוּ. καὶ ἐξεμοῦνται; a free rendering. The word is more literally translated by the pass. of ταράσσειν in v. 22 and by κυμαίνειν in xlvi. [xxvi.] 7.

18 [xxxii. 4]. וְלִקְלָלָה כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה. O′ *vacat.*

20 [xxxii. 6]. וְאֵת כָּל־מַלְכֵי אֶרֶץ הָעוּץ. O′ *vacat.* Gi. considers this clause to be a gloss. On the other hand O′ may easily have omitted it through an error of the eye. SH. read (and without an ast.) καὶ πάντας τοὺς βασ. νήσων, the last words being an easy corruption for τῆς γῆς Οὔζ.

22 [xxxii. 8]. הָאִי. O′ *vacat.*

23 [xxxii. 9]. תֵּימָא and בּוּז are represented in O′ by Θαιμὰν (א* Θωμεὰν) and Ῥῶς (א* Ῥῶθ) doubtless through error.

24 [xxxii. 10]. וְאֵת (1°)...עֲרָב. O′ *vacat.*

25 [xxxii. 11]. וְאֵת (1°)...זִמְרִי. O′ *vacat.* Zimri would here be out of place. "Durch die Stellung sind Araber, Phoenicier, Aethiopen ausgeschlossen" Gi. *ad loc.* See also Wo. p. 44.

מָדַי. Περσῶν. The word is evidently an alternative rendering of עֵילָם. It may, as introduced from the marg. into the wrong place, have supplanted an original Μήδων (which Compl. has), or perhaps the words וְאֵת...מָדָי have been added to the Heb. text by those who were dissatisfied at the omission of the Medes (mentioned in li. [xxviii.] 11, 28), in which case the whole clause, καὶ π. β. Π. will be a dittography of וְאֵת כָּל־מ׳ עֵילָם.

26 [xxxii. 12]. הַצָּפוֹן. ἀπηλιώτου (A τοῦ ἀπ.). O′ uses the word elsewhere only in Ezek. xxi. 3 [xx. 47], xxi. 9 [4], each time in the expression ἀπὸ ἀπ. ἕως βορρᾶ (מִנֶּגֶב צָפוֹן), apparently taking it as the quarter of the wind which blows *from* the midday *sun*. Hence its use here is inexplicable, unless we suppose that the full reading was וְאֶת־כ׳ מ׳ הַנֶּגֶב וְאֶת־כ׳ מ׳ הצ׳, and that the Greek translators omitted the latter part, because it made צ׳ the recipient, and not (as in *v.* 9, and i. 15) the executor, of vengeance.

הָאָרֶץ. O′ *vacat;* obviously an insertion, spoiling the grammar.

וּמֶלֶךְ...אַחֲרֵיהֶם. O′ *vacat;* a clause suggested by the latter part of *v.* 25, making use of the cipher form (called technically Atbash, because in it

א = ת, ב = ש, etc.), which probably came into existence later than J.'s time. See Wo., pp. 245 ff.

29 [xxxii. 15]. הִנָּקֵה תִּנָּקוּ לֹא תִנָּקוּ. *καθάρσει* (Q *καθαρισμῷ*) *οὐ μὴ καθαρισθῆτε.* O′ failed to comprehend the interrogative 'ה; so omitted it.

30 [xxxii. 16]. הֵידָד. *οἶδε*; corrupted from Ἁιδάδ, a transliteration of the Heb. Comp. xlviii. [xxxi.] 33. The last four words of this *v.* are transferred by O′ to the next sentence.

32 [xxxii. 18]. יֵעוֹר. *ἐκπορεύεται*; less literal than the rendering in vi. 22 (*ἐγερθήσεται*).

מִיַּרְכְּתֵי־אָרֶץ. *ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.* See on vi. 22.

33 [xxxii. 19]. בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא. *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Κυρίου*; probably a slip, original or otherwise, in the Greek.

לֹא...יֵאָסְפוּ. O′ *vacat.* M.T. is an insertion drawn from viii. 2.

לְדֹמֶן. *εἰς κόπρια.* See on viii. 2.

34 [xxxii. 20]. וְהִתְפַּלְּשׁוּ. *καὶ κόπτεσθε* (Q *κ. κόψασθε*). But in vi. 26 they render by *καταπάσσειν*, and in Ezek. xxvii. 30 by *στρωννύειν.*

וּתְפוֹצוֹתִיכֶם. O′ *vacat.* If we read the Heb. thus as a subst., it shipwrecks the grammar; if as a verb in Taph., וּתְפוֹצוֹתִיכֶם (so Baer and Del.) or וּתְפִיצוֹתִיכֶם, it somewhat harshly introduces the Lord as speaking. The word is probably corrupt.

"Es ist vielleicht nur aus verwischtem ונפלתם כבלי entstanden, und neben der Correctur stehen geblieben." Stade in *Zeitsch. d. A. T. Wiss.* 1881, p. 68 note.

34 [xxxii. 20]. כִּכְלִי חֶמְדָּה. ὥσπερ οἱ κριοὶ (כִּכָרֵי) οἱ ἐκλεκτοί. As Schwally (*l. c.* p. 137 note) points out, כְּלִי ח׳ occurs in Hos. xiii. 15; Nah. ii. 10; 2 Chr. xxxii. 27, xxxvi. 10, and the variant כרי might easily arise through the influence of אדירי הצאן. Grätz however (quoted by Gi. *ad loc.*) suggests that the original read חֹמֶר, comparing xviii. 4.

37 [xxxii. 23]. נְאוֹת. τὰ κατάλοιπα. The Greek is possibly a corruption for καταλύματα, but in face of the circumstance that the latter word renders סֻכּוֹ in *v.* 38, this is improbable. For O''s treatment of נ׳ see on ix. 9 [10].

אַף־יְהוָה. θυμοῦ μου (Q Κυρίου); reading אַף י׳ as אַפִּי. Comp. vi. 11, xxvii. 18 [15]. Comp. also the converse instance (noticed by Wo., p. 193) in Jon. i. 9, where עִבְרִי is rendered by Δοῦλος Κυρίου (עֶבֶד י׳).

38 [xxxii. 24]. חֲרוֹן הַיּוֹנָה. τῆς (AQ *om.* τῆς) μαχαίρας τῆς μεγάλης; reading חֶרֶב, and doubtless rightly. Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 16, l. [xxvii.] 16, where חֶרֶב occurs in this phrase. In those two passages

'הי is rendered Ἑλληνικῆς, as though הַיְּוָנָה from יָוָן. Here O′'s treatment is less easy to explain. Possibly they read יהוה, and translated freely. So Pesh. reads (ܝܘܢܐ), and one of Kenn.'s MSS. has ח' היונה יהוה. St Jer. renders by *columba*, i.e. Nebuchadnezzar, in reference to the Jewish belief that his standards bore that device.

וּמִפְּנֵי...אַפּוֹ. O′ *vacat.* The clause is an insertion. Accordingly the pron., as Gi. remarks, "schwebt in der Luft."

xxvi. [xxxiii.] 1. מַמְלְכוּת. βασιλέως. O′ is doubtless a corruption of βασιλείας. The Heb. itself however (see Wellhausen, *Der Text d. Bücher Sam.* 1 S. xv. 28) is in all probability a corrupt form of מַמְלֶכֶת.

מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה. O′ *vacat* (Q *hab.*); a gloss.

2. עַל־כָּל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה הַבָּאִים. ἅπασι (AQ πᾶσι[ν]) τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ πᾶσι (אQ *om.* κ. π.) τοῖς ἐρχομένοις. עָרֵי has been introduced from xi. 6.

3. וְנִחַמְתִּי. καὶ παύσομαι; euphemistically, as in *vv.* 13, 19. See xxxi. [xxxviii.] 20. On the other hand μετανοεῖν is the rendering in iv. 28, viii. 6, xviii. 8, 10.

6. (ק') הַזֹּאת. O′ *vacat* (AQ ταύτην); probably an accidental omission. See *vv.* 9, 12.

7. וְהַנְּבִאִים. *καὶ οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται.* So in *vv.* 8, 11. See on vi. 13.

8. צִוָּה. *συνέταξεν αὐτῷ* (צִוָּהֻ; comp. xx. 2).

9. מַדּוּעַ. *ὅτι.* See xxii. 28.

10. שַׁעַר־יְהוָה הֶחָדָשׁ. *πύλης* (A adds *Κυρίου* and Q *οἴκου* K.) *τῆς καινῆς.* SH. testifies to 'יה. Pesh. and Vulg. read 'שׁ' בֵּית יה; but there seems no sufficient ground for rejecting the genuineness of O''s reading, especially as the words 'ב' י, having just preceded, were wholly needless to repeat.

19. וַיִּנָּחֵם. *καὶ ἐπαύσατο.* See on xxxi. 20.

20. עַל־הָעִיר הַזֹּאת וְ. O' *vacat.* Gi. defends the Heb. as agreeing with the wording of *v.* 6. But the argument seems precarious.

21. וְכָל־גִּבּוֹרָיו. O' *vacat.* The expression is not found elsewhere in Jer.

וַיְבַקֵּשׁ. *καὶ ἐζήτουν* (Q *-τησαν*); reading וַיְבַקְשׁוּ.

הַמֶּלֶךְ. O' *vacat.*

וַיִּרָא וַיִּבְרַח. O' *vacat.*

22. אֶת־אֶלְנָתָן...מִצְרָיִם. O' *vacat;* doubtless a gloss. Gi. points out that what we read of Elnathan in xxxvi. 12, 25 would make such an act as this on his part unlikely.

23. הָעָם. *λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*; misunderstanding the

Heb. expression, for which comp. 2 K. xxiii. 6. In xvii. 19 on the other hand (comp. 2 Chr. xxxv. 5, 12, 13) בְּנֵי הָעָם seems to mean the laity.

xxvii—xxix. [xxxiv—xxxvi.]. These chapters are specially interesting in connexion with the problem of the double text. As Wo. (p. 221) says, "The peculiarities appear not only in the frequency, but also in the form, of the divergences." To these peculiarities (to be dealt with in due course) we add (i) such forms as (*a*) יִרְמְיָה (xxvii. 1 etc.) for יִרְמְיָהוּ; so צִדְקִיָּה (xxvii. 12 etc.), יְכָנְיָה (xxviii. 4 etc.), חֲנַנְיָה (xxviii. 1 etc.), (*b*) the later form נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר (frequently; e.g. xxvii. 6, but not in xxix. 21), as against the form with ר which occurs elsewhere in this Book, (ii) the epithet הַנָּבִיא, which is added to J.'s name to an extent out of all proportion to the rest of the Book. If, as Gi. suggests, these chaps. were copied out and sent to Babylon for the especial behoof of the exiles, it is easy to understand that just such divergencies might appear from the influence of the errors and additions (e.g. the greater part of xxvii. 22 [xxxiv. 18]) naturally arising in such MSS., as compared with the copies remaining in Palestine.

xxvii. [xxxiv.] 1. O′ *vacat* (Q marg. *hab.*; reading *βασιλέως*. See on xxvi. 1); obviously a later insertion, either in its present form, or more probably with Zedekiah's name (see on xxviii. 1),

to whose time these three chaps. without doubt belong. In the latter case the substitution of Jehoiakim arose through the influence of xxvi. 1. We may note, as agreeing with the spuriousness of the *v.*, the peculiar spelling both of this name and of Josiah in the original.

2 [1]. אֵלַי. O′ *vacat;* rightly, in accordance with the style of the narrative sections. So Cor. (p. 70).

3 [2]. וְשִׁלַּחְתָּם *καὶ ἀποστελεῖς αὐτούς.* Both texts seem corrupt in the matter of the pron., which has crept in through the influence of the preceding נְתַתָּם.

מַלְאָכִים. (A *τῶν*) *ἀγγέλων αὐτῶν.* The absence of the article would of itself make the Heb. suspicious. Read therefore מַלְאֲכֵיהֶם.

הַבָּאִים יר׳ *τῶν ἐρχομένων εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῶν* (א *-τῷ*) *εἰς* *Ἰερ.* (Q *εἰς* *Ἰερ.* *εἰς ἀπ. αὐ.*). The words *εἰς ἀπ. αὐ.* are clearly a gloss, as the variation in their position helps to shew.

5 [4]. אֶת־הָאָדָם...הָאָרֶץ. O′ *vacat.*

וּבִזְרוֹעִי. *καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐπιχείρῳ* (Q *βραχίονί*) *μου.* So in xlviii. [xxxi.] 25.

6 [5]. וְעַתָּה. O′ *vacat.* They would scarcely have omitted the word, had they found it in their text.

אֶת־כָּל־הָאֲ׳ הָאֵלֶּה. *τὴν γῆν* (A adds *πᾶσαν;* Q *π. τ. γ.*). O′ (against Gi.) preserves the genuine

reading, which thus perfectly fits in with the previous *v.* Subsequent scruples as to the attributing of a *world-wide* dominion to the king of Babylon induced various modifications. Accordingly Aq. Symm. have πάσας τὰς γαίας (ταύτας), Vulg. "omnes terras istas," and so Pesh.; while SH. adopts πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην.

עַבְדִּי. δουλεύειν αὐτῷ; reading לְעָבְדוֹ, and rightly. The subsequent loss of the ל was easy, owing to the ending of the previous word. For the title given by M.T. to Neb. see on xxv. 9.

7. O' *vacat*; Q marg. *hab.* with slight variations and with ὀργῆς instead of γῆς, in which it is supported by SH. "The idea that the dominion of the Chaldæans is to be merely transitory, and is to fall to pieces after the third generation, is decidedly inappropriate in this place, where it is much more to the interest of the prophet to depict the power of Nebuchadnezzar as terribly as possible" (Cor. p. 70).

Evil-Merodach, son and successor to Nebuchadnezzar (c. 562 B.C.) reigned two years (Abydenus, *Fr.* 9, Berosus, *Fr.* 14), or two years and a few months, according to the tablets dated in his reign. He was killed in a rebellion led by his sister's husband, Neriglissar (= Nergal-sharezer), who in three or four years was succeeded by a young son Laborosoarchod, murdered after nine months' reign (Sm. *Dict. of Bible*, Evil-Merodach and Nergal-sharezer).

Thus the *v.* taken literally is not in accordance with history. It is possible that this may account for its omission by O′; but the view seems much preferable that the definite fixing of a termination to the power of Babylon, an announcement which is quite out of harmony with the context, stamps the *v.* as a gloss. In that case it will either be very early, i.e. before the commencement of Nerig-lissar's reign, or on the other hand sufficiently late for the exact relationship of the above series of rulers to have been forgotten.

8 [6]. אֲשֶׁר (1°)...וְאֵת. O′ *vacat*; a gloss, in the earliest form of which Neb. was referred to by the pron. only (אֹתוֹ). The וְאֵת, as Gi. suggests, may be explained as having lost a subsequent בְּנוֹ taken from *v. 7*.

וּבִדְבַר. O′ *vacat.*

עַד־תֻּמִּי אֹתָם. *ἕως ἐκλίπωσιν* (ℵ[c.a] A -λείπ.). The transitive use of תמם is unusual (occurring however in Ps. lxiv. 7). O′ seems to have omitted the suffix and 'א. Possibly (as Gi. thinks) the Targ. דְּאַמְסַר preserves for us here the original reading תִּתִּי, for which we may comp. similar expressions in this context (xxvi. 24, xxvii. 6).

9 [7]. חֲלֹמֹתֵיכֶם. *τῶν ἐνυπνιαζομένων ὑμῖν*; reading apparently חֹלְמֵיכֶם, which the context seems to demand. The M.T. may have been introduced here from xxix. 8.

10 [8]. וְהִדַּחְתִּי אֶתְכֶם וַאֲבַדְתֶּם. O′ *vacat.* The words were suggested by *v.* 15.

12 [10]. בְּעֹל מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל. O′ *vacat.* See next note.

אֹתוֹ...(14 [11]) לֹא תַעַבְדוּ. O′ *vacat.* Probably it is owing in some degree to the recurrence of מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל that this omission has come about. M.T. has every appearance of being genuine, and receives a general support from Pesh. SH. Vulg.

15 [12]. לָכֶם. *ὑμῖν*; adding *ἐπ' ἀδίκῳ ψευδῆ.* The gloss, introduced to prevent any possible misapprehension, is a double one, both words rendering לַשָּׁקֶר. O′ begins *v.* 16 [13] with a second rendering of לָכֶם (*ὑμῖν*). Probably the abovementioned gloss was in some of O′'s MSS. introduced after the *ὑμῖν* of *v.* 15 [12], in others before it. In the latter case the pron. might easily be transferred to the beginning of the next sentence.

16 [13]. עַתָּה מְהֵרָה. O′ *vacat;* obviously an explanatory gloss.

17 [14]. O′ *vacat,* but it substitutes *οὐκ ἀπέστειλα αὐτούς.* M.T. harmonizes both in substance and style with the rest of the passage, and is therefore probably to be accepted. In that case we can only conjecture that O′'s MS. may have been worn or otherwise illegible.

18 [15]—22 [18]. Nowhere is the discrepancy between the two texts more marked than in this passage, and nowhere is it more dangerous to dogmatize. In favour of M.T. it may be urged (*a*) that its amplifications suit the general style of these chapters, (*b*) that O′ bears signs (notably in the grammar of *v.* 16 [19]) of omission, (*c*) that, inasmuch as the vessels here enumerated were in point of fact returned to Jerusalem, there was an obvious inducement for O′ to omit the latter part of *v.* 22.

On the other hand it may be said that the amplifications in M.T. are quite of a nature to be introduced at Babylon or elsewhere by people keenly interested in every circumstance connected with the Captivity, and that inasmuch as the non-fulfilment of the prophecy of 22ᵇ was no hindrance to its retention in the text which has come down to us, we need not be hasty in assuming that it would disappear from the Greek version, which on the whole exhibits signs of faithfully minute translation. O′ is however doubtless somewhat corrupt in its present form.

18 [15]. יִפְגְּעוּ־נָא בַּיהוָֹה. *ἀπαντησάτωσάν μοι*; reading, very possibly rightly, בִּי, which was afterwards (comp. xxv. 37) taken as a contraction (בי׳ = ביהוה).

צְבָאוֹת. O′ *vacat.*

לְבִלְתִּי...בָּבֶלָה. O′ *vacat.* The absence of any

actual mention of that which should be the subject of their prayer involves a harshness which would naturally lead to some such clause as M.T.

19 [16]. צְבָאוֹת...וְעַל־יֶתֶר הַכֵּלִים. Καὶ τῶν ἐπιλοίπων (א ὑπολ.) σκευῶν. It is clear from considerations of grammar that one or more of the objects specified in M.T. have fallen out of the Greek, unless as Cor. (p. 71) proposes, we read κ. ἐπὶ τ. λοιπῶν σκ.

הַנּוֹתָרִים...הַזֹּאת. O′ *vacat.*

20 [17]. נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר. O′ *vacat.*

בֶּן־יְהוֹיָקִים מ׳ יה׳. O′ *vacat.*

בָּבֶלָה...וִירוּשָׁלָם. O′ *vacat.*

21. O′ *vacat.*

22 [18]. וְשָׁמָּה...הַזֶּה. λέγει Κύριος (א adds ὁ θεός). See introductory note on these verses.

xxviii. [xxxv.] 1. בַּשָּׁנָה הַהִיא...יְהוּדָה. O′ *vacat.* The first two words were lost through a confusion of the eye (between בשנה and בשנת). The rest correspond to the Heb. of xxvii. 1 in its earlier and more accurate form. See note there. Cor. (p. 70) considers this *v.* to be out of place and transfers it to the head of xxvii.

3. אֶת־כָּל־כְּלֵי. τὰ σκεύη. כל would of course be easily lost before כלי. On the other hand its absence from O′ in the next *v.* cannot be thus explained.

אֲשֶׁר...בָּבֶל. O′ *vacat.*

4. בֶּן־יהו׳...יְהוּדָה. O′ *vacat.*

וְאֶת־כָּל־גָּלוּת. *καὶ τὴν ἀποικίαν.*

הַבָּאִים...יְהוָה. O′ *vacat.*

5. לְעֵינֵי...כָּל־הָעָם. *κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμοὺς παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμοὺς τῶν ἱερέων.* O′s transposition of the substantives may well have been caused by the last words of the *v.*

8. וּלְרָעָה וּלְדָבֶר. O′ *vacat.*

10. אֶת־הַמּוֹטָה. *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τοὺς κλοιούς*; reading the last word in the pl., as also in *v.* 12, in accordance with its other occurrences in the M.T. of this section. The earlier words are suggested by *v.* 11.

11. בְּעוֹד שְׁנָתַיִם יָמִים. O′ *vacat.* The words are introduced from *v.* 3.

14. הָאֵלֶּה. O′ *vacat.* See on xxvii. 6.

אֶת־נבכדנ׳. O′ *vacat.* M.T. gives us accordingly the *later* form of the name. See introductory note on xxvii—xxix.

וַעֲבָדֻהוּ...לוֹ. O′ *vacat;* an insertion suggested by xxvii. 6.

15. שְׁמַע־נָא חֲנַנְיָה. O′ *vacat;* but perhaps owing only to an error of the eye.

16. כִּי...יְהוָה. O′ *vacat;* introduced from

Deut. xiii. 6, where however (as Gi. points out), unlike the present passage, actual idolatry is spoken of.

xxix. [xxxvi.] 1. יֶתֶר. O' *vacat.* See Gi., who supports the omission. His reasons do not seem quite conclusive; for the word might well be used by one like Jer., if, as is probable, there were already gaps in the number of those whom he thus addressed. Still O' would scarcely have omitted the word, had it been genuine.

הַנְּבִיאִים. O' adds *ἐπιστολὴν εἰς* Βαβυλῶνα *τῇ ἀποικίᾳ.* There could scarcely be a more obvious interpolation. Yet see Wo., p. 86.

אֲשֶׁר...בָּבֶלָה. O' *vacat.* The persons addressed are (against Gi.) quite sufficiently defined by both the preceding and following words, without this extension. SH. inserts the clause, but marks with ast. only the words *ἀπὸ...Βαβυλῶνα.* Aq. Theod. have the words.

2. שָׂרֵי...וִירוּשָׁלַםִ. O' *vacat;* possibly an accidental omission.

וְהֶחָרָשׁ וְהַמַּסְגֵּר. *καὶ παντὸς ἐλευθέρου καὶ δεσμώτου καὶ τεχνίτου* (Q τ. κ. δ.). The first words look like a rendering of וְכָל־הַחֹרִים as a variant upon וְהח'. This is less disturbing to the present Heb. text than to suppose that they stand for וְכָל־הַשָּׂרִים (as a variant for (ושרי יהו' ויר').

3. נבוכדנ׳. O′ *vacat.* Comp. xxviii. 14.

5. גַּנּוֹת. *παραδείσους*; but rendered *κήπους* in *v.* 28.

6. וְתֵלַדְנָה בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת. O′ *vacat.*

7. הָעִיר. *τῆς γῆς*. This rendering reminds us of iv. 29. Either they read here (as probably there) הָאָרֶץ, or their interpretation is Midrashic.

8. וְקֹסְמֵיכֶם. *καὶ μὴ ἀναπειθέτωσαν ὑμᾶς οἱ μάντεις ὑμῶν.*

אַתֶּם מַחְלְמִים. *ὑμεῖς ἐνυπνιάζεσθε*. The Hiph. is not found elsewhere, its form is Aram. rather than Heb., and the causative sense is not needed. Hence, and inasmuch as O′ seems to have read Ḳal, we may conjecture with some confidence that the case is one of dittography. Cor. however (p. 61) would further change א׳ to הֵם, because in xxiii. 25, 27, 28 (so in O′ *v.* 32, where see note; comp. O′ in xxvii. 9) it is "the false prophets who have dreams and use them as the vehicle of their false prophecies."

10. הַטּוֹב. O′ *vacat.*

אֶתְכֶם. *τὸν λαὸν ὑμῶν* (Q *τ. λ. μου*). Pesh. SH. Vulg. agree with M.T. Gi. suggests that the Greek may be due to the reflection that at the end of the 70 years those now addressed would be dead.

11. אָנֹכִי (1°)...אֲשֶׁר. O′ *vacat*; an accidental omission, arising from the recurrence of אָנֹכִי.

אַחֲרִית וְתִקְוָה. *ταῦτα.* Aq. Theod. Pesh. SH. (ܣܘܦܐ ܘܣܒܪܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ) Vulg. support M.T. The words were perhaps illegible in O′'s Heb. text.

12. וּקְרָאתֶם אֹתִי וַהֲלַכְתֶּם. O′ *vacat.* Illegibility, as in the last case, may explain the omission. However, as the M.T. stands, והל׳ looks strange. Symm. has instead *καὶ εὑρήσετε,* Targ. וַאֲקַבֵּל צְלוֹתְכוֹן. Hence M.T. seems corrupt.

14. וְנִמְצֵאתִי לָכֶם. *καὶ* (Q om. *κ.*) *ἐπιφανοῦμαι ὑμῖν.* This *may* be a rendering of the present Heb.

נְאֻם...מִשָּׁם. O′ *vacat.* The tenor of the *v.* shews it to be a later addition, relating, as it does, to a *general* dispersion, unsuitable to the present context.

16—20. O′ *vacat.* It is difficult to believe that a passage so thoroughly apposite in its method of dealing with the circumstances of the earlier period of the exile could be a later composition. We note also that Theod. (and apparently Aq. Symm.) Pesh. SH. Vulg. place it here. A grave objection however to that position is that it severs the logical connexion existing between *vv.* 15 and 21. A clue to the solution of the problem is given by those MSS. (Lucianic) which place the passage *before v.* 15. It is impossible to say how the dislocation arose. Gi.'s suggestion (see his careful note on the whole passage) that the cause was the

occurrence of כִּי followed by אמר at the beginning of *vv.* 15 and 16, seems dubious. The omission by O′ is more easily accounted for, if we attribute it either to the occurrence of the substance of most of these *vv.* already in xxiv. 8—10ᵃ, or to the translators' dislike to call Egyptian attention to the detailed threats of punishment directed against Israel, or last and perhaps best (with Cor., p. 61, who however condemns the passage as an early insertion), to the passing of the writer's eye from בבלה (*v.* 15) to בבלה (*v.* 20).

21. בֶּן־קוֹלָיָה. O′ *vacat.*

בֶּן־מַעֲשֵׂיָה...שֶׁקֶר. O′ *vacat.*

23. שֶׁקֶר. O′ *vacat;* introduced from *v.* 21.

הַיּוֹדֵעַ (ק') וָעֵד. μάρτυς. The Heb., as it stands, is ungrammatical, while the כ' can only be explained as equivalent to הוּא יֹדֵעַ. Probably the word is a gloss.

25—29. O′ misunderstands this passage, failing to see that what we have to deal with in the earlier part of it is a letter from Shemaiah to Zephaniah and others at Jerusalem. This is so clearly put in M.T. that we can only attribute the bulk of the variations to the state of O′'s Heb. text. Hence the straits to which they are reduced, e.g. in making the prophet speak of himself in the 3rd p. (*v.* 27), in the omission (*ibid.*) of a negative,

in the mention (*v.* 29) of an unexplained *βιβλίον*, and in general in the utter lack of logical connexion which prevails throughout their version of *vv.* 25—29.

25. כֹּה...בִּירוּשָׁלַםִ. O′ *vacat;* but substitutes *Οὐκ ἀπέστειλά σε τῷ ὀνόματί μου*, suggested by *v.* 31.

וְאֶל כָּל־הַכֹּהֲנִים. O′ *vacat.*

25, 26. לֵאמֹר׃ יְהוָה. *εἶπεν* Κύριος (so Bא; AQ *εἰπεῖν* K.).

26. פְּקִדִים. *ἐπιστάτην.* The sing. is supported by Symm. Targ. Pesh. Vulg., but M.T. can scarcely have arisen from it. The *thought* includes the duties of Zeph. and his predecessor. Hence the plural.

אֶל־הַמַּהְפֶּכֶת וְאֶל־הַצִּינֹק. *εἰς τὸ ἀπόκλεισμα καὶ εἰς τὸν καταράκτην*; a case of transposition, inasmuch as 'מה is rendered by *κατ.* in xx. 2.

27. לֹא גָעַרְתָּ. *συνελοιδορήσατε* (א *ἐλοιδ.*; Q *οὐκ ἐπετιμήσατε*).

28. כִּי עַל־כֵּן שָׁלַח אֵלֵינוּ. *οὐ* (א* om. *οὐ*; AQ *ὅτι*) *διὰ τοῦτο ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς* (Q* *ἡμᾶς*).

גַּנּוֹת. *κήπους.* See *v.* 5.

32. יוֹשֵׁב. O′ *vacat.*

בְּתוֹךְ־הָעָם הַזֶּה. *ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν.*

וְלֹא־יִרְאֶה. *τοῦ ἰδεῖν*; reading לִרְאוֹת.

לְעַמִּי. *ὑμῖν.* Unless we suppose that these particular words were illegible in the text used by O′, there seems no reason why they should not have rendered them. On the other hand M.T. in each of the two cases is an easy expansion.

נְאֻם־יְהוָה. O′ *vacat.*

כִּי...עַל־יְהוָה. O′ *vacat.* M.T. was suggested by Deut. xiii. 6 (see on xxviii. 16). O′ here substitutes *οὐκ ὄψονται*, a marg. gloss on *τοῦ ἰδεῖν.*

xxx. [xxxvii.] 5. שָׁמָעְנוּ. *ἀκούσεσθε*; a change arising obviously from the difficulty of reconciling the use of the 1st p. with the utterance as spoken by the LORD.

6. אִם־יֹלֵד זָכָר. *εἰ ἔτεκεν ἄρσεν.* We may note that this use of the Ḳal in a sense emphatically limiting it to the female is by no means in universal accordance with Heb. usage, e.g. ii. 27; Gen. iv. 18, x. 8, 13 etc.; Ps. ii. 7. O′ adds to the above the following gloss: *καὶ περὶ φόβου ἐν ᾧ καθέξουσιν ὀσφὺν καὶ σωτηρίαν.*

מַדּוּעַ. *διότι.* This, as a substitute for *διατί*, is often presented to us elsewhere, e.g. by Q in ii. 31, by ℵ[c.a.c.b] AQ in viii. 19.

לְיֵרָקוֹן. *εἰς ἴκτερον* (*jaundice*). 'יר is rendered *ὤχρα* in Deut. xxviii. 22.

7. הוֹי. *ἐγενήθη* (as the last word of *v.* 6); connecting with היה. So *ἐγένοντο* in Mic. ii. 1.

8. מֵעַל צַוָּארֶךָ וּמוֹסְרוֹתֶיךָ. ἀπὸ τοῦ (אAQ om. τοῦ) τραχήλου αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν. O′, reading the 3rd p. in both cases, harmonizes with the rest of the *v.* The Heb. is easily accounted for, the language being suggested by ii. 20 (and perhaps Is. x. 27), while the variation of person is far from unusual. However the two cases of that variation here are by no means on all fours as regards support from other versions. צו׳ is supported by Aq. Symm. Theod. Pesh. Vulg. In the case of מוס׳ Pesh. (not Vulg.) supports the 2nd p., against which reading can also be pleaded the parallelism which might be expected with עָלּוֹ.

וְלֹא־יַעַבְדוּ־בוֹ עוֹד זָרִים. καὶ οὐκ ἐργῶνται αὐτοὶ ἀλλοτρίοις (A ἐν ἀλλ.); failing to understand the Heb. idiom. Comp. xxv. 11.

9. אֲשֶׁר. O′ *vacat*; thus restoring the balance of the clauses.

10, 11. O′ *vacat*. The *vv.* occur in both texts in xlvi. [xxvi.] 27, 28. See on xi. 7, and on xv. 13. Their language suggests that they are made up from various passages of this and other prophets. For the solemn introductory וְאַתָּה see Is. xli. 8. Neither is Israel elsewhere in this Book (except in the parallel passage) called עַבְדִּי (an expression found Ezek. xxxvii. 25). For the language of *v.* 11 comp. xv. 20, xlii. [xlix.] 11, and for other arguments (perhaps less convincing) against the

genuineness of the *vv.* See Gi. and Cor. *ad loc.* The latter (p. 66) calls attention to "the sudden appearance here of Jacob-Israel, while elsewhere throughout the whole speech only Judah-Israel is mentioned, and Jacob alone occurs in *vv.* 9, 18."

12. אָנוּשׁ לְשִׁבְרֵךְ. *ἀνέστησα σύντριμμα* (A adds *σου*); thus connecting the first word with נשא.

נַחְלָה. *ἀλγηρά.* See on iv. 19.

13. לְמָזוֹר רְפֻאוֹת. *εἰς ἀλγηρὸν ἰατρεύθης.* In Hos. v. 13 מז׳ (*ὀδύνην*) is parallel to חָלְיוֹ. This, while so far justifying O′'s rendering, leaves the use of the word here in the opposite sense unexplained. The division of the *v.* in M.T. is supported by xlvi. 11, which supplies the second clause here.

תְּעָלָה. *ὠφέλια* (Q -*εια*); connecting with the Hiph. of יעל, as in xlvi. [xxvi.] 11.

15. O′ *vacat;* but see next note. The first part is suggested by x. 19, xv. 18; the second is identical with the latter part of *v.* 14; for the third see below.

16. כֻּלָּם בַּשְּׁבִי יֵלֵכוּ. *κρέας αὐτῶν πᾶν ἔδονται* (כָּל־בְּשָׂרָם [יכלו] יֹאכֵלוּ). Yet in xxii. 22 O′ rendered בש׳ י׳ correctly. O′ proceeds to insert here a rendering of 15 b, viz. *ἐπὶ πλῆθος ἀδικιῶν* (א *δικαίων*; A *ἀδικίας*) *σου ἐπληθύνθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι*

*σου, ἐποίησαν ταῦτά σοι*, the last three words representing M.T.'s conclusion to *v.* 15.

17. אֲרֻכָה. *τὸ ἴαμα.* Comp. *ἴασις* in viii. 22.

צִיּוֹן. *θήρευμα ὑμῶν*; reading צֵיד or צִיד' = צֵידְכֶם. But this does not suit the context. Other conjectural emendations are צִיּוּן, *a monument*, a (mere) way-mark for the traveller (so J. D. Michaelis), צָיוֹן (Is. xxv. 5, xxxii. 2), *a desert, a dried-up place* (Graetz), עֲנִיָּה, *pitiable* (Gi.).

18. אָהֳלֵי. O' *vacat.* The translators were puzzled, probably as being unaware that this term was not necessarily used in its literal sense. Comp. 1 K. viii. 66.

וּמִשְׁכְּנוֹתָיו. *καὶ* (Q *τὴν*) *αἰχμαλωσίαν* (A *τὴν ἀποικίαν*) *αὐτοῦ*; reading apparently וּמְשֻׁבוֹתָיו. Compare O''s treatment of the actual מְשׁוּבָה in this Book. See on iii. 6.

וְאַרְמוֹן. *καὶ ὁ λαός* (Q[a] *ναός*); to be added to the list of renderings of 'א given in note on vi. 5.

19. תוֹדָה. *ᾄδοντες*; a loose rendering (see on xxiv. 5); but comp. xxxiii. [xl.] 11 for one still more free.

וְהִכְבַּדְתִּים וְלֹא יִצְעָרוּ. O' *vacat.*

20. וְהָיוּ. *καὶ εἰσελεύσονται*; Midrashic.

וַעֲדָתוֹ. *καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτῶν* (וְעֵדֹתָיו).

21. אַדִּירוֹ. *ἰσχυρότεροι*; perhaps reading אבירי׳ (=אַבִּירִים).

This *v.* bears conspicuously the marks of an unskilled translator. In the middle the reference of the obj. pron. is changed from the sing. to the plural. וְנִגַּשׁ is rendered *καὶ ἀποστρέψουσιν* (Q however has *ἐπιστ.*) and לָגֶשֶׁת by *ἀποστρέψαι* (AQ *ἐπιστρέψαι*). Comp. on *vv.* 23, 24.

22. O′ *vacat.*

23, 24. Repeated almost *verbatim* from xxiii. 19, 20. The variations in O′ are sufficient to make a different and less skilled translator to be probable; e.g. הִנֵּה...סַעַר is here rendered *ὅτι ὀργὴ* Κυρίου *ἐξῆλθεν θυμώδης, ἐξῆλθεν* (א *ἐπῆλθεν*) *ὀργή*, but there *ἰδοὺ σεισμὸς παρὰ* Κυρίου *καὶ ὀργὴ ἐκπορεύεται εἰς συνσεισμόν.*

23. מִתְגּוֹרֵר. *στρεφομένη*; in xxiii. 19 מִתְחוֹלֵל and *συστρεφομένη*. Gi. considers that מִתְגּוֹלֵל was the original reading in both places.

24. תִּתְבּוֹנְנוּ בָהּ. *γνώσεσθε* (א *ἐπιγν.*) *αὐτά.* Comp. xxiii. 20.

N.B. In some Heb. Bibles xxxi. 1 (בָּעֵת וגו׳) is given as xxx. 25, and xxxi. 2 as xxxi. 1, and so on to the end of that chapter.

xxxi. [xxxviii.] 2. מָצָא חֵן. *εὗρον θερμὸν* (חֹם). Aq. Symm. Theod. have *χάριν*. St Jer. "ridicule Latini codices...*lupinos* interpretati sunt."

עִם שְׂרִידֵי. *μετὰ ὀλωλότων*, reading עִם שְׂמִידֵי (or possibly שְׂרוּדֵי).

הָלוֹךְ לְהַרְגִּיעוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל. *βαδίσατε καὶ μὴ ὀλέσητε τὸν Ἰσραήλ.* Possibly the וֹ (see Perles, p. 74) is the old nominative ending. O′ may have seen the root הרג in the word, but it is more likely that they read לֹ[א]־תַרְחֵצוּ. The best emendation (so Gi.) seems to be לְמַרְגּוֹעוֹ (so Vulg. *ad requiem suam*). For sense of רגע see on iv. 20, l. 34.

3. לִי. *αὐτῷ.* The following ו (not rendered by O′) may have produced this variant. Cor. however (p. 66) suggests that the Heb. copyist "stumbled at לו, which would refer to ישראל in *v.* 2, because the whole subsequent address, after בתולת ישראל, is in the feminine."

4. עוֹד 1°. *ὅτι* (but ℵAQ *ἔτι*).

עוֹד 2°. O′ *vacat* (AQ *ἔτι*. Comp. next note).

תַּעְדִּי. *ἐπιλήμψει* (ℵ -*ψῃ*; AQ *λήμψῃ*). Comp. iv. 30, where *κοσμεῖν* is the verb used.

5. עוֹד. *ὅτι* (ℵ* *ὅτι ἔτι*; AQ *ἔτι*).

נִטְעוּ נֹטְעִים. *φυτεύσατε* (but ℵc.a Qa *φυτεύσαντες φυτ.*; AQ* *φύσαντες φυτ.*); reading simply נִטְעוּ.

וְחִלֵּלוּ. *καὶ αἰνέσατε*; reading וְהִלְלוּ. But even if, with O′, we substitute ה for the ח of M.T., it is very possible that the verb may be used in a

special sense corresponding to the subst. הִלּוּלִים used (Lev. xix. 24; Jud. ix. 27) of harvest or vintage gatherings.

6. נֹצְרִים. *ἀπολογουμένων* (א -*νου*); an unexplained rendering. Gi. suggests an original כֹּרְמִים, *vine-dressers*, from the previous context.

7. הוֹשַׁע יְהוָה אֶת־עַמְּךָ. Ἔσωσεν Κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; reading הוֹשִׁיעַ יה׳ א׳ עַמּוֹ. As Gi. points out, from the use of the expression liturgically (Hosanna) the 2nd p., as in M.T., might easily arise. O"s form is therefore to be preferred, the more so, as Targ. supports it. Cor. (p. 66) considers M.T. to be an intentional alteration, owing to the non-fulfilment of the promise.

8. בָּם עִוֵּר וּפִסֵּחַ. *ἐν ἑορτῇ φάσεκ*; reading בְּמוֹעֵד הַפֶּסַח.

הָרָה וְיֹלֶדֶת יַחְדָּו. *καὶ τεκνοποιήσῃ*; rendering וי׳ very loosely, and omitting the other two words.

9. יָבֹאוּ. *ἐξῆλθον*; reading יָצְאוּ.

וּבְתַחֲנוּנִים. *καὶ ἐν παρακλήσει*; *perhaps* reading וּבְתַנְחֻמִים, but on the other hand we find the kindred subst. תְּחִנָּה always rendered by ἔλεος in this Book (xxxvi. [xliii.] 7, xxxvii. [xliv.] 20, xxxviii. [xlv.] 26, xlii. [xlix.] 2).

אוֹלִיכֵם and לֹא יִכָּשְׁלוּ. *αὐλίζων* and *οὐ μὴ πλανηθῶσιν*; renderings not found elsewhere.

10—14. See Cor.'s reasons (p. 66) for believing these *vv.* to be spurious.

12. The *v.* is remarkable for its loose renderings; ἥξουσιν for נָהֲרוּ (though used four words earlier for בָּאוּ), καρπῶν for יִצְהָר, ξύλον ἔνκαρπον for גַּן רָוֶה, here (as J. F. Schleusner observes *ad loc.*) giving the species for the genus, as in the previous case the genus for the species.

לְדַאֲבָה. πεινάσουσιν; reading לְרַאֲבָה.

13. יַחְדָּו. χαρήσονται; reading יַחֲדוּ (or יֶחֱדוּ). Pesh. represents both (ܐܟܚܕܐ ܢܚܕܘܢ).

וְנִחַמְתִּים. O′ *vacat.* The parallelism is against the word.

מִיגוֹנָם. O′ *vacat.* Some such word however is needed. See next note.

14. וְרִוֵּיתִי. Μεγαλυνῶ καὶ μεθύσω. The first word probably represents the מִיגוֹנָם of *v.* 13, which they seem to have connected with גָּאוֹן.

הַכֹּהֲנִים. τῶν ἱερέων υἱῶν Λευεὶ (א τ. υἱ. Λ. τ. ἱερ.). The last words are evidently a gloss.

דֶּשֶׁן. O′ *vacat;* perhaps from the difficulty which the word presents in connexion with וְרִוֵּיתִי.

15. עַל־בָּנֶיהָ 1°. O′ *vacat* (AQ *hab.*). Pesh. omits the words on their second occurrence. The other authorities are in favour of them. It is of

course possible that an accidental omission of these words in some MS., followed by an insertion of them from the margin in different places in two copies, may be the origin of their recurrence here in M.T. If we are to choose between their two positions, the first seems preferable.

17. וְיֵשׁ...לִגְבוּלָם. *μόνιμον τοῖς σοῖς τέκνοις.* These words are clearly meant as a rendering of תִּקְוָה לְאַחֲרִיתֵךְ, while the remainder of the M.T. is unrepresented. MSS. 22, 36, and others however agree to prefix *καὶ ἔσται ἐλπὶς τῆς ἐσχάτης σου*, as though considering the preceding words to be the rendering of the *second* part of the *v.* We can scarcely understand the brevity of O′, combined with lack of correctness in grammar, unless by supposing some injury to have befallen their Heb. text; for the parallelism demands two clauses.

19. שׁוּבִי. *αἰχμαλωσίας μου*; reading שִׁבְיִי; but wrongly.

נִחַמְתִּי. *μετενόησα.* This suits the parallelism, as opposed to *παρεκλήθην* of Aq. (but see Field); with which agree Targ. (מִתְנַחֵם עֲלָנָא) Pesh.

סָפַקְתִּי עַל־יָרֵךְ בֹּשְׁתִּי. *ἐστέναξα ἐφ' ἡμέρας αἰσχύνης*; reading apparently סָפַדְתִּי עַל־יוֹם בֹּשֶׁת.

וְגַם־נִכְלַמְתִּי. *καὶ ὑπέδειξα.*

20. O′ ignores the interrogative character of

the first part of the *v.*, apparently because to their minds it expressed a doubt, or more than a doubt, of God's power.

מִדֵּי דַבְּרִי בּוֹ. *ἀνθ' ὧν οἱ λόγοι μου ἐν αὐτῷ.* Gi. suggests that the context rather requires a word expressing indignation, and suggests כְּהִתְעַבְּרִי בּוֹ. Even if we retain the text, we may safely give ב a hostile sense, as in Numb. xxi. 7; Ps. l. 20.

הָמוּ מֵעַי. *ἔσπευσα*; Midrashic. Compare the treatment of a similar phrase in iv. 19, and for the fear of anthropomorphism xxvi. 3 with references; also xii. 14, xiii. 17, xviii. 17, xxvi. [xxxiii.] 19, xxxvi. [xliii.] 26, xlii. [xlix.] 10, (xlviii. [xxxi.] 31), xlix. 35 [xxv. 15].

21. צִיֻּנִים. Σειὼν (ℵAQ Σιών). But St Jer. (see Field *ad loc.*) seems to have found Σειωνίμ, a transliteration (through ignorance of the meaning of the word) which might easily be corrupted to the present text.

תַּמְרוּרִים. *τιμωρίαν.* The same sort of corruption (arising from a transliteration) has taken place here. We cannot however accept M.T., 'ת not being found except in the sense which it bears *v.* 15 (and which O′ had no difficulty in dealing with there). Read therefore (with Gi.) תִּמֹּרִים, literally, *palms*; here in the sense fixed by the 'צ of the parallel clause, but not recognised by O′. Aq. has *πικρασμούς*, Vulg. *amaritudines*.

לַמְסִלָּה. *εἰς τοὺς ὤμους* (א^{c.a}A add *σου*); apparently a corruption of *οἴμους*.

אֵלֶּה. *πενθοῦσα*; probably reading אָנָה. Comp. וְאָנוּ, perhaps = *καὶ πενθήσουσιν* in Is. iii. 26.

22. הַבַּת הַשּׁוֹבֵבָה. *θυγάτηρ ἠτιμωμένη.* Comp. xlix. [xxx.] 4, *θυγ. ἰταμίας*. Aq. in both places has *ἡ ῥεμβεύουσα*.

חֲדָשָׁה בָּאָרֶץ נְקֵבָה תְּסוֹבֵב גָּבֶר. *σωτηρίαν εἰς καταφύτευσιν καινήν, ἐν* (א *εἰς*) *σωτηρίᾳ* (AQ *ᾗ σωτ.*; א *-ρίαν*) *περιελεύσονται ἄνθρωποι*; a Midrashic rendering, which is intended to indicate that such shall henceforth be the freedom from danger of attack, that women will suffice for the land's defence, while men discharge the avocations of peace. It is clear however that O''s present text is somewhat different from that which St Jer. speaks of, "quoniam te creavit Dominus salute in plantationem novam, in salute tua circuibunt homines." Vulg. accords with M.T.

23. נְוֵה־צֶדֶק הַר הַקֹּדֶשׁ. *ἐπὶ δίκαιον ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ*; ignoring the first word, possibly as so much resembling the ending of the previous one, and setting Heb. grammar at nought in their rendering of צ' ה'.

24. וְיָשְׁבוּ...עָרָיו. *καὶ* (א^{c.a} AQ *οἱ*) *ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν Ἰούδα* (A om. *τ.*; אQ *τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ*) *καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ*; not seeing that בָּהּ refers

back to the אָרֶץ of the previous *v.*, and not understanding how עָרָיו could be the subject of the verb. The words *καὶ ἐν π. τ. γ. αὐ.* represent a gloss.

יַחְדָּו אִכָּרִים וְנָסְעוּ בָּעֵדֶר. *ἅμα γεωργῷ, καὶ ἀρθήσεται ἐν ποιμνίῳ.* There is a good deal to be said (see J. D. Michaelis *ad loc.*) for pointing the first of these words either יֶחֱדוּ, *laetabuntur*, or יַחֹרוּ, *arabunt*, thus closing the *v.* with two short and well-balanced clauses of appropriate meaning. 'Αρθ. represents the root נסע (comp. Numb. ii. 17, *ἀρθήσεται*; 1 K. v. 31 [3 K. vi. 2], 2 K. iv. 4) in the sense of *journey*, *advance*, which verb however O′ read in the sing. Aq. Symm. Pesh. Vulg. (*minantes*) read it as the ptcp.

25. דָּאֲבָה. *πεινῶσαν.* See on *v.* 12.

28. לִנְתּוֹשׁ...וּלְהָרֵעַ. *καθαιρεῖν καὶ κακοῦν.* See on i. 10.

32. בָּעַלְתִּי. *ἠμέλησα* (so in Heb. viii. 9). See on iii. 14. The clear sense of M.T. there forbids us to accept O′ as a rendering of the Heb. We may read therefore ג for ב (comparing O′'s translation of געל in xiv. 19), a change which is commended by the improved sense thus obtained.

33. נָתַתִּי. *διδοὺς δώσω* (AQ om. *δώσω*). See on iii. 1, xxii. 24.

35 [36]. חֻקֹּת. O′ *vacat.* The word may be

a gloss upon הַחֻקִּים of the next *v.* It may also however, as Gi. suggests, be a corruption of מְחֹקֵק, borrowing the מ from יוֹמָם. This would much improve the balance of the clauses, but it assumes that the corruption had taken place before O''s time, who accordingly omitted the word.

רֹגַע. *καὶ κραυγήν*, but *ὁ ταράσσων* in Is. li. 15, where M.T. is word for word the same as in this clause. O′ seems here to have read וְרֹגֵשׁ (so Wo., with וְרֹנֵן as an alternative). For the meaning of רגע see on iv. 20.

37 [35]. יִמַּדּוּ. *ὑψωθῇ*; as though reading יָרֻמוּ. Their failure to understand the general drift of the *v.* led to their subsequent mistranslations. For their introduction of a negative see on xviii. 18.

39. וְנָסַב גֹּעָתָה. *καὶ περικυκλωθήσεται κύκλῳ ἐξ ἐκλεκτῶν λίθων.* For *περικυκ. κύκ.* see on iii. 1. In Ezra [2 Esd.] v. 8 אֶבֶן גְּלָל is rendered *λίθοι ἐκλεκτοί.* Accordingly O′ probably saw the same root here. Targ. has בְּרֵכַת עֶגְלָא, *the pool of the calf*, Pesh. ܠܓܒܥܬܐ, *to the hill.*

40. וְכָל־...(1°)...וְהַדֶּשֶׁן. O′ *vacat*, probably owing to the recurrence of וְכָל־, rather than (with Gi. p. xxxi) to the unintelligibility of the words.

xxxii. [xxxix.] 2. וְאָז. Kal.

5. יוֹלִךְ אֶת־צִדְקִיָּהוּ. *εἰσελεύσεται Σεδεκίας*; perhaps reading יֵלֵךְ, and disregarding the אֶת. There can be however but little doubt that the Hiph. is right. This may be an example of O′'s tendency, with which Wellhausen (*Text. d. Bücher Sam.* p. 10) deals, to use the same Greek verb for the rendering of Ḳal and of other voices indifferently.

עַד...יְהוָה. O′ *vacat.* The Heb. is all but identical with xxvii. 22 [xxxiv. 18], where O′ is also lacking.

כִּי...תַצְלִיחוּ. O′ *vacat;* a natural gloss to creep into the text in the time of the exile.

6. Clearly the original form of the *v.* began with וַיְהִי (omitting וַיֹּאמֶר יר׳). Of the two changes natural on the part of those who desired greater clearness, M.T. represents the one, O′ the other.

7. מִשְׁפַּט הַגְּאֻלָּה לִקְנוֹת. *κρίσις* (ℵAQ *κρίμα*) *παραλαβεῖν εἰς κτῆσιν.* This would stand fairly enough as a somewhat free rendering of the M.T. When however we find that הַגּ׳ in *v.* 8 (see note there) meets with such different treatment, we must conclude that in the earlier case O′ either failed to understand it (which is unlikely, as the word occurs frequently in Lev. xxv.), or did not find it in their text.

8. אֲשֶׁר־בַּעֲנָתוֹת אֲשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ בִּנְיָמִין. *τὸν ἐν γῇ Βενιαμεὶν τὸν ἐν Ἀναθὼθ* (Q *τὸν ἐν Ἀν. ἐν γῇ Βεν.*). The words 'א' בא' בנ, in themselves superfluous, are further condemned by the variation in position.

וּלְךָ הַגְּאֻלָּה. *καὶ σὺ πρεσβύτερος*; reading ד for א.

9. אֲשֶׁר בַּעֲנָתוֹת. O′ *vacat.*

11. אֶת־הֶחָתוּם הַמִּצְוָה וְהַחֻקִּים וְאֶת־הַגָּלוּי. *τὸ ἐσφραγισμένον*; but ℵA add *καὶ τὸ ἀνεγνωσμένον* (Q pref. *ἀνεγνωσμένον καί*). 'הַמּ' והחק are probably a gloss, while on the other hand וְהַגָּלוּי will be observed to have considerable support. See Field's note, which also mentions Cappellus's conjectural variant *ἀνεῳγμένον*. See also Stade's discussion of the passage in *Zeitsch. d. A. T. Wissenschaft* v. pp. 175—178.

12. הָעֵדִים. *τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν παρεστηκότων*; (עֹמְדִים; ℵAQ vary slightly, Q adding *μαρτύρων*).

הַכֹּתְבִים. *καὶ γραφόντων* (Q *γραψάντων*). It is remarkable that Targ. (דִּכְתִיבִין) Pesh. (ܕܟܬܝܒܝܢ) and Vulg. (*qui scripti erant*) all represent הכתובים, a reading which is found in 14 of Kenn.'s MSS. and 34 of de Rossi's. Can O′ have had originally *γραφέντων*?

הַיֹּשְׁבִים. O′ *vacat.*

14. אֶת־הַסְּפָרִים הָאֵלֶּה. O′ *vacat.*

וְאֵת הֶחָתוּם. O′ *vacat.* The word was introduced from *v.* 11.

הַגָּלוּי. *τὸ ἀνεγνωσμένον.* See on *v.* 11. Stade l. c. gives as resultant text of *v.* 14

כה אמר יהוה צבאות לקוח את ספר המקנה הזה את החתום ואת הגלוי ונתתה בכלי חרש למען יעמד ימים רבים :

17. אֲהָהּ. ʻΟ ὤν. See on i. 6.

הַנְּטוּיָה. *τῷ ὑψηλῷ καὶ τῷ μετεώρῳ* (א om. *κ. τ. μετ.*; Q om. *τῷ* 2°); a conflate rendering.

18, 19. יהוה צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ : גְּדֹל. O′ has (with slight variations in אQ), as second clause of *v.* 19, *ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ μεγαλώνυμος Κύριος.* The last five words of the Greek represent in the main the four Heb. words given above, the variant arising in some way from a scribe's error, while the words *ὁ θ. ὁ μ.* seem to be an accidental repetition from *v.* 18. See Wo., pp. 76 f.

19. גְּדֹל. O′ pref. *Κύριος.*

פְּקֻחוֹת. O′ *vacat.*

וְכִפְרִי מַעֲלָלָיו. O′ *vacat.* The words come from xvii. 10.

20. וּבָאָדָם. *καὶ ἐν τοῖς γηγενέσιν*; a remark-

able rendering, as though hinting at the derivation of the Heb. word. The nearest parallel is in Ps. xlix. [xlviii.] 3, where γηγ. renders בְּנֵי אָדָם.

21. וּבְמוֹרָא גָּדוֹל. (22) *καὶ ἐν ὁράμασιν μεγάλοις.* The words agree with Deut. xxvi. 8; comp. Deut. iv. 34. It is noteworthy that O''s rendering of them in both those passages is precisely the same as here; thus connecting מ' with ראה.

23. וַתִּקְרָא. *συμβῆναι*, but B[ab]א[c.a(?)]AQ pref. *καὶ ἐποίησαν*. In either case O''s rendering, if not corrupt, is peculiar.

24. הַסֹּלְלוֹת. *ὄχλος*. See on vi. 6.

וְהַדֶּבֶר. O' *vacat.* The word is introduced from such passages as xxi. 7, xxiv. 10.

וְהִנְּךָ רֹאֶה. O' *vacat;* a natural accretion.

25. וְהָעֵד עֵדִים. O' *vacat*, but substitutes *καὶ ἔγραψα* (A *εἰς*) *βιβλίον καὶ ἐσφραγισάμην, καὶ ἐπεμαρτυράμην μάρτυρας.*

26. יִרְמְיָהוּ. *μέ*; rightly.

28. יְהוָה. *Κύριος ὁ θεὸς 'Ισραήλ* (א om. *ὁ θ. 'Ι.*).

הִנְנִי נֹתֵן. *Δοθεῖσα παραδοθήσεται.* See on iii. 1. They may possibly have read הִנָּתֹן תִּנָּתֵן (comp. *v.* 4); but this is made very improbable by the fact that they render the same Heb. similarly elsewhere, viz. xxxiv. [xli.] 2.

30. אַךְ. *μόνοι*; apparently a very early error

for *μόνον*. Aq. *πλήν*, Symm. 1st ed. and Theod. *μόνοι*, Symm. 2nd ed. *διόλου*. See Field.

כִּי בְנֵי...יְהוָֹה. O′ *vacat.* This part of the *v.* is weak. Also why should its reference, in spite of the preceding clause, be confined to Israel? It may therefore be safely taken as a gloss.

33. 1° וְלַמֵּד. *καὶ ἐδίδαξα* (BᵇA om.). It is possible that O′ may have found וָאֲלַמֵּד, as Gi. suggests, but their giving to 2° וְלַמֵּד precisely the same rendering would make it probable that with them, as with us, the two words were identical in form. This argument is however *somewhat* weakened by the fact that BᵇA do not recognise 2° ול'.

34. לְטַמְּאוֹ. *ἐν ἀκαθαρσίαις αὐτῶν* (לְטַמְּאָן or) בְּטֻמְאָ.

35. לַמֹּלֶךְ. *τῷ Μολὸχ βασιλεῖ* (Q om. *β.*); a double rendering.

36. לָכֵן. O′ *vacat.*

אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים. *σὺ λέγεις* (אַתָּה אֹמֵר); probably rightly, and so in *v.* 43. The M.T. would arise, as an emendation, out of xxxiii. 10, and, as regards the second word, would only involve the difference between אמר and אמר'.

וּבַדָּבֶר. *καὶ ἐν ἀποστολῇ.* Everywhere else ד' is rendered *θάνατος* or *λοιμός*. The present render-

ing may be illustrated by the same word as representing מִשְׁלַחַת (Ps. lxxviii. [lxxvii.] 49), apparently in the sense of a pestilence as sent by God. Comp. the use of ἀποστ. in Baruch ii. 25.

39. אֶחָד *bis.* ἑτέραν *bis* (אַחֵר).

40. לְהֵיטִיבִי אוֹתָם. O′ *vacat.* Gi. suggests that the words may have been inserted as the result of a corruption in those immediately preceding, where accordingly he proposes the emendation לֹא אֶשְׁבֹּת מֵרַחֲמָם, on the ground that the expression in M.T. rather suits the people's relation to God than His to them.

41. וְשַׂשְׂתִּי. καὶ ἐπισκέψομαι; a remarkable rendering. The Heb. expression is supported, as Gi. points out, by Deut. xxviii. 63, xxx. 9.

43. וְנִקְנָה הַשָּׂדֶה. καὶ κτηθήσονται ἔτι ἀγροί; as though reading וְנִקְנוּ עֹד שָׂדֹת. The sing. may have come through the influence of the שָׂדֶה of the earlier part of the chapter.

אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים. σὺ λέγεις. See on *v.* 36.

xxxiii. [xl.] 2. עֹשָׂהּ יְהוָה. ποιῶν γῆν. The Heb. pron., as it stands here and later in the *v.*, has no definite reference, unless, as is proposed by Gi., we transpose *vv.* 2, 3. Accordingly O′ gives a rendering, which may have been suggested by Is. xlv. 18, but is more likely to be an indication that they read עֹשֵׂה הָאָרֶץ.

4. הַסֹּלְלוֹת. χάρακας (Q -κα). See on vi. 6.

הֶחָרֶב. προμαχῶνας; Midrashic.

5. בָּאִים לְהִלָּחֵם אֶת־הַכַּשְׂדִּים. τοῦ μάχεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς Χαλδαίους. M.T. seems corrupt. We want the Chaldeans to be the subject of this, as they must be of the next clause, and this almost certainly involves the excision of אֶת (though read by O′), as it is difficult to find a clear case of that particle accompanying the subject of any but a passive verb. Neh. ix. 32 is perhaps the most plausible instance. 1 S. xvii. 34 (see Driver there) is best explained otherwise. In the present passage by the omission of בָּאִים O′ does not after all to any appreciable extent get rid of the obscurity in the sense. (So generally Cor. p. 64. See his further remarks.)

6. מַעֲלָה. ἀνάγω (A ἐπ.). See on viii. 22.

וּרְפָתִים וְגִלֵּיתִי לָהֶם. καὶ φανερώσω αὐτοῖς καὶ ἰατρεύσω αὐτὴν (א καὶ ἰατ. αὐτὴν κὲν εἰρήνῃ καὶ φαν. αὐτοῖς εἰσακούειν καὶ ἰατ. αὐτήν; A καὶ ἰατ. αὐτοὺς καὶ φανερώσω αὐτοῖς εἰσακούειν καὶ ἰατ. αὐτούς; Q is as A, except that it reads φανεροί); reading the first word וּרְפִיתִיהָ, from which the form in M.T. would easily arise owing to the neighbouring לָהֶם.

עֲתֶרֶת. O′ *vacat* (א^{c.a}AQ καὶ ποιήσω αὐτοῖς).

עתר' is ἅπ. λεγ. It is taken to mean *abundance*, as connected with the root which occurs in that sense in Ezek. xxxv. 13; Prov. xxvii. 6. This sense is however dubious here, and has not the support of any early authority. Aq. has (? 1st ed.) *εἰσακούειν*, and (? 2nd ed.) *ἴασιν*. Symm. has *προσευχήν*; so Vulg. *deprecationem*. Although the root frequently bears that sense, it seems to have no relevancy here.

8. וְסָלַחְתִּי. *καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι* (א *μνησθῶ*); although as lately as xxxi. 34 they rendered *ἵλεως ἔσομαι*.

9. וְהָיְתָה לִּי לְשֵׁם שָׂשׂוֹן. *καὶ ἔσται εἰς εὐφροσύνην*; thus omitting לִי and שֵׁם. Inasmuch as *in sense* Jerusalem is the subject of הָיְתָה, Gi. ingeniously conjectures that in לי לשם we have fragments of that word. If so, the case is an interesting one, as presenting a corruption which O′ dealt with by omission and Heb. scribes by unsuccessful emendation.

10. וּבְחֻצוֹת. *καὶ ἔξωθεν*.

וּמֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב. O′ *vacat*.

11. תּוֹדָה. *δῶρα* (AQ add *αἰνέσεως*). See on xxx. 19. In xvii. 26 ת' appears as *αἴνεσις*, but there the context would exclude the sense of gifts, which is at least a possible one here.

אֶת־שְׁבוּת. *πᾶσαν τὴν ἀποικίαν* (A *τ. ἀπ. πάσης*).

14—26. O′ *vacat*. Whether these *vv.* are to be attributed to the prophet himself, or whether we are to see in their language (e.g. *v.* 18 הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם, and the absence of a single definite personage as the object of Messianic expectation) traces of a subsequent writer, it is very improbable that O′ would have designedly omitted them. The proclamation of the Messianic hope, and of the permanence of David's line, the emphasis placed upon the priestly office, as well as the renewal of the assurance to the people as a whole, given in the concluding *vv.*, would have all appealed strongly to such men as the translators. We must therefore conclude that they were wanting in their Heb. text.

As to the question whether they were rightly so wanting, see Gi.'s summary of the opinions of previous commentators, and discussion of the evidence. He decides against the genuineness of the passage, but points out that the expressions (*v.* 18) הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם, (*v.* 21) הַל׳ הַכּ׳, (*v.* 22) הַל׳ מְשָׁרְתֵי אֹתִי are so well adapted to the time of Jer., though not used by him elsewhere, that if the writer is to be placed much later than the time of Malachi, we must allow that he is purposely employing an archaism.

Cor. (p. 65), summarily rejecting the present passage in M.T., would substitute xxiii. 7, 8, as

being (*a*) most appropriate here in respect of subject-matter, (*b*) authentic in itself, as supported by all the versions in xvi. 14, 15 (see note there), in which particular place however it interrupts the sense, (*c*) at least suspicious in xxiii. in view of its varying *position* in M.T. and O′. See note on *v.* 7 there.

In this passage not only are *vv.* 14—16 almost a repetition of xxix. 10, xxiii. 5, 6, but *v.* 17 is closely connected with xxxv. [xlii.] 19, while there is a likeness between 20, 22, 25, 26 and xxxi. [xxxviii.] 35—37.

xxxiv. [xli.] 1. מַמְלְכוֹת. O′ *vacat;* and so SH. But the Heb. which remains is still rough and probably needs some correction.

וְכָל־הָעַמִּים. O′ *vacat.*

נִלְחָמִים. ἐπολέμουν αὐτὸν (but ℵAQ om. αὐτόν).

עָרֶיהָ. τὰς πόλεις Ἰούδα; an amplification suggested by i. 15. Comp. Zech. i. 12.

2. 1° וְאָמַרְתָּ. O′ *vacat.* It is true, as Gi. says, that we have but one other instance in this Book (xxxv. 2) of הָלֹךְ אֶל, whereas ה׳ joined by ו to a verb of speaking is frequent. It by no means follows however that this is an adequate defence of M.T. here; for the very rarity of the one, combined with the frequency of the other con-

struction might well be the cause of the introduction of 'ואֹ.

הִנְנִי נֹתֵן. *Παραδόσει παραδοθήσεται.* See on xxxii. 28.

וּשְׂרָפָהּ. *καὶ συλλήμψεται αὐτὴν καὶ καύσει αὐτήν* (Q* om. *κ. κ. αὐ.*). וּלְכָדָהּ, which O′ seems to have read, may be genuine (so Gi. p. xxvi), but again such passages as *v.* 22, xxxvii. 8 (comp. xxxii. 3, xxxviii. 3) suggest an interpolation.

3. אֶת־עֵינֵי מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל. *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ.*

וּפִיהוּ אֶת־פִּיךָ יְדַבֵּר. O′ *vacat;* but AQ have *καὶ τὸ* (A om. *τὸ*) *στόμα αὐτοῦ μετὰ τοῦ στόματός σου λαλήσει.* In Pesh. the pronouns change places, evidently in order to harmonize more closely with the previous clause. The expression in xxxix. 5 (וַיְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ מִשְׁפָּטִים) used of Nebuchadnezzar is sufficiently like this to justify us in accepting the words and so in conjecturing that the omission in Bא is accidental, while at the same time the two expressions are sufficiently different to make it improbable that they are an insertion suggested by that passage. The form given in Pesh., as introduced for an obvious purpose, is clearly the later.

4. עָלֶיךָ לֹא תָמוּת בֶּחָרֶב. O′ *vacat* (Q *οὐκ ἀποθανῇ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ*). It is hard (against Gi.) to see a sufficient reason for O′'s omitting these words, if genuine.

5. וּבְמִשְׂרְפוֹת. *καὶ ὡς ἔκλαυσαν.* O′ read כ for ב, and translated as though it were the root ספד; so below, יִשְׂרְפוּ, *κλαύσονται.* Aq. has *τοὺς ἐμπυρισμοὺς* and *ἐμπυρίσουσι.* This rendering was incumbent upon him, owing to his extreme literalness. It is unlikely that the original form of O′ was *ἔκαυσαν, καύσονται.*

הַמְּלָכִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים אֲשֶׁר־הָיוּ לְפָנֶיךָ. *τοὺς βασιλεύσαντας πρότερόν σου.*

וְהוֹי אָדוֹן. *καὶ ἕως ᾅδου*; looking like the corruption of a transliteration. But B[a marg.] adds *ὦ κύριε,* and AQ* insert the same before *κ. ἕ. ᾅδ.* This may be, as Perles (p. 83) suggests, a reminiscence of xxii. 18, where however הוֹדה was left untranslated. See note there.

7. הַנּוֹתָרוֹת. O′ *vacat* (AQ[a] *τὰς καταλελιμμένας*; Q* *-λειμ.*).

8. לָהֶם. O′ *vacat.* So Vulg.

9. לְבִלְתִּי עֲבָד־בָּם בִּיהוּדִי אָחִיהוּ אִישׁ. *πρὸς τὸ μὴ δουλεύειν ἄνδρα* (א *-ας*) *ἐξ Ἰούδα* (A *Ἰσραήλ*). O′ read מִיהוּדִי, and apparently had not אח׳. They also failed, as in xxv. 11 (see note there) to perceive the sense of עבד ב. Gi. considers that neither ביה׳ nor מיה׳ represents the original reading, and that the *v.* ended with בָּם עוֹד (comp. *v.* 10), while the latter word was corrupted to מ[י]הוד[י], the מ arising from dittography, through בם, and then being

altered, as in M.T., to ב in order to harmonize better with the sense of that word. Thus according to him both אָחִיהוּ and אִישׁ are glosses. The latter however is distinctly represented in O′, and is in all probability genuine.

10. וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ. *καὶ ἐπεστράφησαν*; apparently by confusion of eye with וַיָּשׁוּבוּ which begins *v.* 11.

לְבִלְתִּי...(11) חָפְשִׁים. O′ *vacat*; a mistake owing to the recurrence of חָפְשִׁים, while the omission would be rendered all the easier, since the word וַיָּשׁוּבוּ had been already dealt with (see last note) by the scribe. It is curious that 'חפ itself has not been rendered in either *v.*, although represented in *vv.* 9, 16 (*ἐλευθέρους*). It should be added that לְבִלְתִּי עֲבָד־בָּם עוֹד וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ here may well be an accidental repetition of the same words as ending *v.* 9 (see note there) and beginning *v.* 10.

14. שֶׁבַע. *ἕξ*; to harmonize with the numeral that follows, and not to be accounted for by any difference in their Heb. text.

תְּשַׁלְּחוּ. *ἀποστελεῖς* (תְּשַׁלַּח); thus agreeing more closely with the words of Deut. xv. 12.

מֵעִמָּךְ. O′ *vacat*. The word may easily have been introduced later from the *v.* in Deut.

אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם. O′ *vacat*.

15. וַתָּשֻׁבוּ אַתֶּם. *Καὶ ἐπέστρεψαν* (A *ἔστρ.*);

and so for *συνετέλεσαν* which follows. We can only suppose that this retention of the person of the former verbs was caused by a failure of attention on the part of the translator or a copyist.

16. וְתִּכְבְּשׁוּ אֹתָם. O′ *vacat.* The clause is suggested by *v.* 11.

17. אִישׁ לְאָחִיו וְ. O′ *vacat.*

לִזְוָעָה קְ′. *εἰς διασποράν*, but in xv. 4 *εἰς ἀνάγκας*.

18. אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הֵקִימוּ אֶת־דִּבְרֵי הַבְּרִית. These words, though appearing in O′ (but not א*A), are clearly an early interpolation, meant as an explanation of the immediately preceding אֶת־בְּרִיתִי, which was thus erroneously interpreted to refer to the broken covenant with the released slaves.

אֲשֶׁר כָּרְתוּ לְפָנַי הָעֵגֶל. *ἣν ἐποίησαν κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου, τὸν μόσχον.* If we read לִפְנֵי, and alter O′ to correspond, the grammatical difficulty in connexion with עֵגֶל disappears. The traditional pointing of לְפָנַי seems to have arisen from the pron. aff. in בְּרִיתִי.

אֲשֶׁר כָּרְתוּ לִשְׁנַיִם וַיַּעַבְרוּ בֵּין בְּתָרָיו. *ὃν* (א om. *ὃν*) *ἐποίησαν ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτῷ.* O′ did not find כ′ לש′ ו′, and in the absence of these words gave a vague rendering to the remainder. כ′ לש′ were the addition of a scribe whose eye sprang from

3° אֲשֶׁר to 2° אֲשֶׁר, and, writing in consequence of this mistake כרתו over again, completed the sense (having regard to the subsequent context) by inserting לִשְׁנַיִם. So apparently Gi.

19. שָׂרֵי יְרוּשָׁלַםִ. O′ *vacat*.

וְכֹל עַם הָאָרֶץ. καὶ τὸν λαόν.

הָעֹבְרִים...הָעֵגֶל. O′ *vacat*. Gi. considers (but quite needlessly) that O′'s omission is because of the consciousness of their foregoing ill-success, "da sie nach *v.* 18 mit dem Kalb nichts anzufangen wussten."

20. וּבְיַד מְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשָׁם. O′ *vacat*. The words would naturally be inserted, as being suggested by such passages as xix. 7, xxi. 7 etc., and the parallelism of the *v.* is affected by their absence only so far that the latter section thus becomes considerably longer than the former. It is true that there is otherwise a general consensus of authority for them (SH. without an ast., Targ. Pesh. Vulg.), but we can hardly suppose that O′ would have intentionally omitted them, while their *accidental* disappearance is extremely improbable, when we consider that they are absent also from *v.* 21.

נִבְלָתָם. τὰ θνησιμαῖα αὐτῶν. See on vii. 33.

21. וּבְיַד מְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשָׁם. O′ *vacat*. The words receive the same support from other versions as in *v.* 20 (see note there). The two occurrences thus

stand or fall together. The question however of their effect on the parallelism in this *v.* involves that of the treatment of the words which follow. See next note.

וּבְיַד חֵיל מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל. *καὶ δύναμις βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος.* O′ omits בְּיַד, and treats 'ח as nominative, thus shipwrecking the grammar of the Greek clause. Thereby however they have preserved for us, as Gi. says, an indication of the original shape of the Heb. text; viz. that it formed the beginning of a new sentence (making *v.* 22) וְחֵיל מֶלֶךְ הָעֹלֶה מֵעֲלֵיכֶם הִנְנִי וגו׳. "And as for etc." It is true that this change, if we also omit the words dealt with in the preceding note, leaves *v.* 21 with but one member, but this does not seem to be a very serious objection to the arrangement.

הָעֹלִים מֵעֲלֵיכֶם. *τοῖς ἀποτρέχουσιν* (A *οἱ ἀποτρέχοντες*) *ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν*; as though reading לָעֹלִים מֵעֲלֵיהֶם.

xxxv. [xlii.] 2. הַלְּשָׁכוֹת. *τῶν αὐλῶν*; but in *v.* 4 both *παστοφόριον* (and so in 1 Chr. ix. 26) and *οἶκος* (so in xxxvi. [xliii.] 10, 20).

4. בְּנֵי חָנָן. *υἱῶν Ἰωνὰν υἱοῦ Ἀνανίου* (א *Ἀννάν*, א* *Ἀννανίου*), but Q om. Ἰ. *υἱοῦ.*

5. לִפְנֵי בְּנֵי בֵית־הָרֵכָבִים. *κατὰ πρόσωπον*

*αὐτῶν*. Here only is בְּנֵי used in their designation. See *vv.* 2, 3, 18. O′ therefore is to be preferred.

7. לֹא־תִטְּעוּ ׀. O′ *vacat.*

8. לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר צִוָּנוּ. O′ *vacat.*

11. נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר. Ναβουχοδονοσόρ. See introd. note to chaps. xxvii.—xxix.

אֲרָם. *τῶν Ἀσσυρίων*; not reading אַשּׁוּר, but giving this sense to אֲרָם, inasmuch as it formed an important portion of the Assyrian Empire, and these bands were sent by Nebuchadnezzar.

בִּירוּשָׁלָם. *ἐκεῖ.*

12. אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ. *πρός μέ.* It is more natural to retain the 1st p. in accordance with the previous context, thus taking 'יר as a gloss.

14. הוּקַם אֶת־דִּבְרֵי יְהוֹנָדָב. *ἔστησαν ῥῆμα υἱοὶ Ἰωναδάβ*; freely, and not implying a different text.

עַד־הַיּוֹם...אֲבִיהֶם. O′ *vacat.*

15. הַשְׁכֵּם וְשָׁלֹחַ. O′ *vacat;* introduced from such passages as vii. 25. See on vii. 13.

16. אֲשֶׁר צִוָּם. O′ *vacat.*

17. יְהוָֹה...יִשְׂרָאֵל. *Κύριος*; "an altogether unparalleled accumulation of Divine names, in which M.T. stands entirely alone." Cor. p. 59.

יַעַן...עָנוּ. O′ *vacat.*

18. וּלְבֵית הָרֵכָבִים אָמַר יִרְמְיָהוּ. O′ *vacat.* The spuriousness is indicated by this use of the 3rd p., as compared with the preceding context.

כֹּה. *διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως* (לָכֵן כֹּה); taken by confusion of eye from the opening of the next *v.*

שְׁמַעְתֶּם. *ἤκουσαν υἱοὶ* ’Ιων. *υἱοῦ* ‘P.; and so the remaining 3rd persons in the *v.* appear as 2nd persons. Gi. defends M.T., considering the change in O′ to be consequential (but how so?) upon the error of eye referred to in the last note. Rather we may say that the introduction of the gloss (וּלְבֵית וגו׳) at the beginning of the *v.* led to the change in the persons.

וַתִּשְׁמְרוּ אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹתָיו. O′ *vacat.*

19. לָכֵן...יִשְׂרָאֵל. O′ *vacat.* Having accidentally given לָכֵן (see note on כֹּה, *v.* 18), they did not repeat it. The rest is a gloss.

לְיוֹנָדָב. *τῶν υἱῶν* ’Ιωναδάβ; Midrashic.

כָּל־הַיָּמִים. *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς γῆς*; Midrashic.

xxxvi. [xliii.] 1. הָיָה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ מֵאֵת יְהוָה. *ἐγενήθη λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς μέ.* The rest of the chapter is in the 3rd p. The Greek

however has very much the air of the original opening as written by the prophet himself, while M.T. gives us the same as altered to agree with the form of the sequel.

2. יִשְׂרָאֵל. Ἰερουσαλήμ (but AQ* as M.T.); rightly.

יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ. O′ adds *βασιλέως Ἰούδα.*

6. וּבָאתָ אַתָּה. O′ *vacat.*

בַּמְּגִלָּה אֲשֶׁר־כָּתַבְתָּ מִפִּי אֶת־דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה. *ἐν τῷ χαρτίῳ* (אAQ *χάρτῃ*) *τούτῳ.* Gi. thinks that O′'s omission is to be accounted for by their having failed to understand the construction. It is true that some Greek MSS. (and the Vulg.) wrongly place אֶת־ד׳ י׳ in the relative sentence, but this is a very different thing from omission. Rather, the six Heb. words seem to be a badly combined pair of glosses. The aff. in תִּקְרָאֵם is no objection to this view, as its antecedent has been *virtually* mentioned in the previous clause (בַּמְּגִלָּה). Gi. (*ad loc.* and p. xxxi) says that the claim of the words אֶת־ד׳ י׳ to stand in the Heb. text is shewn by the fact that the pronoun referring back to them in the concluding word of the *v.* (תִּקְרָאֵם) is rendered by O′. Since however O′'s rendering there is *ἀναγνώσῃ αὐτοῖς*, *to them* (the hearers), it is plain that his argument falls to the ground.

9. הַחֲמִשִׁית. *τῷ ὀγδόῳ*, but AQ *τῷ πέμπτῳ*,

and so text of SH. If before the time of our oldest Heb. MSS. numbers were expressed by letters, there is nothing surprising in the confusion of ה and ח. "[The number *eight*] seems to tally with the notices in 2 K. xxiv. The vassalage of Jehoiakim is there said to have lasted three years; [upon] this followed the rebellion; while the siege of Jerusalem was reserved for the short reign of Jehoiachin. Now, as this siege must have been the punishment of Jehoiakim's rebellion, and as the reign of the latter king lasted eleven years, we are brought to the same date as that given by Josephus [*Ant.* x. 6. 1] for the commencement of the vassalage, viz. the eighth year." Cheyne *ad loc.*

2° וְכָל־הָעָם...בִּירוּשָׁלָם. *καὶ* (A pref. *ὁ*) *οἶκος* '*Ιούδα*. The Heb. is altered to accord with the end of *v.* 6.

12. שְׁמַעְיָהוּ. *Σελεμίου* (א *Σεδεκίου*). Apparently the error arose under the influence of the Σ. of *v.* 14.

וְאֶלְנָתָן. *καὶ* '*Ιωναθὰν* (AQ* *Ναθάν*). In *v.* 25 we find '*Ελναθὰν* (A *Ναθάν*). (In xxvi. [xxxiii.] 22 O′ omits the name.) Accordingly in the present case '*Ιων*. seems an early lapse into the common name, while, as the error was not repeated in *v.* 25, A in both places and Q* here, puzzled at the diversity, omitted the sacred part of the name.

13. בְּסֵפֶר. O′ *vacat.*

14. אֶל־בָּרוּךְ. *πρὸς Βαροὺχ υἱὸν Νηρίου*; a gloss.

אֶת־יְהוּדִי. O′ *vacat* (A *τὸν* Ἰ*ουδεί*; Q *τὸν* Ἰ*ουδείν*); apparently an accidental omission.

15. שֵׁב. Π*άλιν* (שֻׁב). The M.T. reading is more natural and graphic. Targ. however is not, as Gi. says, in its favour (תּוּב).

16. פָּחֲדוּ. *συνεβουλεύσαντο*; loosely.

17. הַגֶּד־נָא לָנוּ. O′ *vacat.*

מִפִּיו. O′ *vacat;* a gloss, which spoils the sense, and has been introduced from *v.* 18.

18. יִקְרָא אֵלַי. *ἀνήγγειλέν* (Q *-γελλέν*) *μοι* Ἰ*ερεμίας* (Q om. Ἰ*ε.*).

בַּדְּיוֹ. O′ *vacat.* They may easily have been ignorant of the meaning of this *ἅπ. λεγ.* As however they do not very frequently resort to omission by way of escaping a difficulty, we should probably read (so Gi.) by metathesis of letters בְּיָדוֹ, but at the same time consider (not so Gi.) that the word is a gloss. See Wo., pp. 47 f.

20. אֱלִישָׁמָע הַסֹּפֵר. Ἐ*λεισά* (AQ *-σαμά*), and so in *v.* 21.

אֵת כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים. *πάντας τοὺς λόγους*, but A (not, as Gi. says, "LXX") adds *τούτους*.

22. בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַתְּשִׁיעִי. O′ *vacat.*

וְאֶת־הָאָח. *καὶ ἐσχάρα πυρός* (וְאָח הָאֵשׁ); doubtless rightly. The אֶת־ is in itself suspicious.

מְבֹעָרֶת. O′ *vacat.*

23. יִקְרָעֶהָ. *ἀπέτεμνεν* (A *ἀπέτεμεν*) *αὐτάς* (אA *αὐτά*). The pl. pron. is not after all inaccurate, inasmuch as the Heb. tense indicates that this operation was performed for *every* three or four leaves. In the Targ. the pronoun is altogether unrepresented. Pesh. Vulg. have it in the sing.

24. פָּחֲדוּ. *ἐζήτησαν*; but AQ and others have *ἐξεζήτ.*, and so SH. These point to the original *ἐξέστησαν*, which appears in MSS. 41, 87, and is adopted in Compl.

25. אֶלְנָתָן. Ἐλναθάν (A Ναθάν). See on *v.* 12.

לְבִלְתִּי שְׂרֹף. *πρὸς τὸ* (א[c.a]AQ ins. *μὴ*) *κατακαῦσαι.* The misunderstanding which induced the omission of the negative (for such omissions see on xviii. 18) probably was caused by the גַּם. We can hardly however suppose that O′ would have failed to be corrected in their view by the following clause, had it stood in their Heb. text.

וְלֹא שָׁמַע אֲלֵיהֶם. O′ *vacat* (Q *καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσεν αὐτῶν*; so MSS. 86, 88). See last note.

26. וְאֶת־שֶׁלֶמְיָהוּ בֶּן־עַבְדְּאֵל. O′ *vacat.*

וַיַּסְתִּרֵם יְהוָה. καὶ κατεκρύβησαν (Q[c] adds ὑπὸ Κυρίου); softening the expression, in order to avoid anthropomorphism. Comp. xxxi. [xxxviii.] 20.

31. אֶת־עֲוֺנָם. O′ *vacat.*

עֲלֵיהֶם. ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν, but ℵAQ* αὐτοὺς (perhaps 'עלי' read as עָלָו).

אִישׁ יְהוּדָה. γῆν Ἰούδα (ℵ* τὴν Ἰδουμαίαν, ℵ[c.a] τ. Ἰουδαίαν; Q τ. γ. Ἰούδα); an early error.

32. וְיִרְמְיָהוּ...הַסֵּפֶר. καὶ ἔλαβεν Βαροὺχ χαρτίον ἕτερον. The M.T. (against Gi.) has probably arisen from the influence of the command in *v.* 28.

xxxvii. [xliv.] 1. מֶלֶךְ. O′ *vacat.* Here the absence of the article is in itself suspicious.

כָּנְיָהוּ בֶּן־יְהוֹיָקִים. Ἰωακείμ (but AQ pref. Ἰεχονίου υἱοῦ); an accidental omission.

4. הָעָם. τῆς πόλεως (reading הָעִיר). MSS. 23, 62, 88, 233 have τοῦ ὄχλου, and so SH.

5. הַצָּרִים עַל־יְרוּשָׁלַםִ. O′ *vacat.*

מֵעַל. ἐπί (but ℵ[c.a]AQ ἀπό); an obvious error.

7. תֹאמְרוּ. ἐρεῖς (perhaps 'תאמר' read as תאמר). Hence O′'s reading, as given in the next note.

אֶתְכֶם אֵלַי. πρὸς σέ. O′ were thus led (see last note) to read as אֵלֶיךָ ('אלי'), and ignore אֶתְכֶם, as though an error in their Heb. text.

9. אַל־תַּשִּׁאוּ נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם. *μὴ ὑπολάβητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν*; confusing Hiph. of נָשָׁא with Kal of נָשָׂא (although they recognised the former in iv. 10); so in xlix. 16 [xxix. 17] הִשִּׁיא, *ἐνεχείρησεν*.

12. לַחֲלֹק מִשָּׁם. *τοῦ ἀγοράσαι ἐκεῖθεν* (א^c.a marg. adds *ἄρτον*; so MSS. 22, 36, and others, and so SH. marg.). This supports the possibility that here (as in *v.* 13) we have a case of transposition of letters, and that O′ read לִלְקֹחַ, a verb which they thus render in 2 Chr. i. 16 (comp. Neh. x. 32 [2 Esd. xx. 31]). Aq. Theod. have *μερισθῆναι*, and Symm. *μερίσασθαι*; thus taking it (rightly) to refer to an inheritance.

13. בַּעַל פְּקִדֻת. *ἄνθρωπος παρ' ᾧ κατέλυεν* (AQ *κατέλυσεν*); reading the root קפד by transposition, inasmuch as *καταλύων* corresponds to קִפַּדְתִּי in Is. xxxviii. 12.

15. בֵּית הָאֵסוּר. O′ *vacat*.

16. כִּי בָא. *καὶ* (א* *ὅτι*) *ἦλθεν* (וַיָּבֹא); obviously rightly. For a converse case see on viii. 3.

הַחֲנֻיוֹת. *τὴν χερέθ* (MS. 88 *τὴν ἀνιώθ*); thus making no attempt to get rid of the word (see on xxxviii. 14 and p. 5). Aq. has *ἐργαστήρια*, Vulg. (*in*) *ergastulo*.

17. וַיִּקָּחֵהוּ. *καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτόν*; a free rendering.

בְּבֵיתוֹ. O′ *vacat*.

דָּבָר. *ὁ λόγος* (but ℵAQ om. *ὁ*); inaccurately, the Heb. being indefinite.

19. עֲלֵיכֶם ו. O′ *vacat.*

20. שְׁמַע־נָא. O′ *vacat.*

וְאַל־תְּשִׁבֵנִי. *καὶ τί ἀποστρέφεις με;*

xxxviii. [xlv.] 1. וּפַשְׁחוּר בֶּן־מַלְכִּיָּה. O′ *vacat;* apparently an accidental omission, helped by the occurrence of 'פש already in the enumeration.

2. וּבַדָּבֶר. O′ *vacat;* as often, e.g. xxi. 9, xxvii. 8 [xxxiv. 6], xxxii. [xxxix.] 24, xlii. [xlix.] 17, xliv. [li.] 13.

3. כֹּה. *ὅτι οὕτως* (כִּי כֹה); probably rightly.

4. דֹּרֵשׁ. *χρησιμολογεῖ,* but B^{ab}ℵAQ have *χρησμ.* See on viii. 2.

5. אֵין הַמֶּלֶךְ יוּכַל אֶתְכֶם דָּבָר. *οὐκ ἠδύνατο ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς αὐτούς;* reading אִתָּם, and thus making the clause a remark of the narrator. The tense of יוּכַל will then be explained as denoting the permanent condition of the king. The endeavour to make the words part of Zedekiah's speech would easily lead to the change to אֶתְכֶם.

6. וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ. O′ *vacat.*

הַבּוֹר. *λάκκον* (but ℵAQ *τὸν λ.*). The anomalous insertion of the article in the Heb. perhaps arose from the 'הב of xxxvii. 16.

וַיְשַׁלְּחוּ אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ בַּחֲבָלִים. *καὶ ἐχάλασαν αὐτὸν* (Q *sub* "*πάντες*" with ast. adds *ἐν σχοινίοις*) *εἰς τὸν λάκκον*. The last words of both texts are probably glosses.

וַיִּטְבַּע יִרְמְיָהוּ. *καὶ ἦν* (Q* om. *ἦν*); reading וַיְהִי, afterwards supplanted by the gloss.

7. אִישׁ סָרִיס. O′ *vacat*.

8. מִבֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ. *πρὸς αὐτόν*. Each is probably a gloss.

9. אֲדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ. O′ *vacat*.

הֵרֵעוּ...תַּחְתָּיו. *ἐπονηρεύσω ἃ ἐποίησας τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον*; altered thus in order to express more literally and fully the actual facts.

11. בַּחֲבָלִים. O′ *vacat*.

12. שִׂים נָא...יָדֶיךָ. *ταῦτα θές* (Q *θὲς ταῦτα*); M.T. (but not so Gi. p. xxxi) constructing its gloss by the help of *v.* 11.

14. אֶל־מָבוֹא הַשְּׁלִישִׁי. *εἰς οἰκίαν ἀσελεισήλ* (א *ἀσαλιήλ*, A *σαλαθιήλ*, Q* *ἀσιλισιήλ*). Whatever may have been the precise nature of O′'s perplexity, their treatment of the word may make us hesitate to assume (with Gi. and others) that in many of the preceding passages they arbitrarily altered and shortened the Heb. text with which

they were dealing. Gi. conjectures that as in 2 S. xxiii. 8 הַשָּׁלִשִׁי is an error for הַשָּׁלִשִׁים (but this is by no means certain; see Driver there), so here too we should add a ם, and understand the expression as referring to the entrance of the king's body-guard. See 2 K. vii. 2 etc.

16. בַּסֵּתֶר. O′ *vacat*.

אֲשֶׁר 2° ... נַפְשֶׁךָ. O′ *vacat*.

20. בְּקוֹל. τὸν (A om. τὸν) λόγον. Here only in O.T. is λ. a representative of קוֹל, which with very few exceptions appears as φωνή. Thus O′ seem to have read דְּבַר; a fact which is important in relation to *v.* 27. See note there.

22. הָטְבְּעוּ. καταλύσουσιν (Q κατισχύσουσιν); reading הִטְבִּעוּ, and making רַגְלֶךָ the object.

23. תִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ. κατακαυθήσεται (תִּשָּׂרֵף). So Targ. Pesh., suiting the parallelism. The את is of course by no means a conclusive objection.

25. מַה־דִּבַּרְתָּ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ. τί ἐλάλησέν σοι ὁ βασιλεύς; (Q τί ἐλάλησας πρὸς τὸν βασ.;). This is only a slip; for the converse words at the end of the *v.* are correctly translated.

27. הַדָּבָר. λόγος Κυρίου. Whether O′ actually read the Divine Name, or only inserted it as Midrashic, there is a good deal to be said (against

Gi.) for their rendering, taken in connexion with *τὸν λόγον* of *v.* 20, where see note. It was *this* word which was not reported. See Wo.'s sensible remarks (pp. 92 f.) on O''s reading here.

28 and xxxix. [xlvi.] 1. וְהָיָה...יְרוּשָׁלָֽםִ. Καὶ ἐγένετο. The Heb. words clearly belong to the beginning of the next ch., as even the marg. note suggests. The omission of all but the first may be due either to their absence from O''s Heb. text, or to failure to perceive their connexion with xxxix. 3, owing to the long digression. Vulg. has *et factum est ut caperetur Ierusalem*.

xxxix. [xlvi.] 1. בַּשָּׁנָה הַתְּשִׁעִית...בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָעֲשִׂרִי. *τῷ* (א pref. *ἐν*) *μηνὶ* (AQ *ἐν τῷ ἔτει*) *τῷ ἐνάτῳ τοῦ Σεδεκία* (so B*; B^{ab}אAQ *-ίου*) *βασιλέως Ἰούδα* (AQ add *ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ δεκάτῳ*). Bא thus exhibit an early error, which acted upon their rendering of lii. 4. (See note there.) Verses 1, 2 here, over long for a parenthesis, break the connexion and are apparently an abbreviated edition of lii. 4—7 (so Gi.). Unlike *vv.* 4—13, they appear to have come into the text by O''s time.

3. In both M.T. and O' no less than six princes are enumerated. In the M.T. of *v.* 13 on the other hand (O' is there lacking) four only (besides Nebuzar-adan) are given, one of them differing in name from any of those in *v.* 3. The great variation in the spelling of the names in the Greek MSS., both as compared with each other and

with M.T., makes it evident that they were sufficiently unfamiliar to the Jewish ear. Gi.'s proposed restoration of the text reduces the number of names to two. He argues thus.

1°. Nergal-sharezer stands in both *vv.* 2°. The first part of Samgar-nebo is a confusion for Sar-mag = Rab-mag, *chief of the magicians* (the title of 1°), while the latter portion, as never ending a name, is to be transferred to the beginning of the 3rd name. (With this arrangement Septuagint MSS. agree, prefixing *καὶ* to the Ναβου., while in ℵAQ the *καὶ* before Σαμαγ. is absent.) 3°. Sarsechim, thus becoming Nebo-sarsechim, is an error for Nebo-shasban of *v.* 13. 4°. Rab-saris is a title, *chief of the eunuchs.* According to this view, 5° and 6° are a gloss, perhaps a marg. note introduced for the purpose of correcting the Samgar.

4—10. O′ *vacat.* The *vv.* interrupt the train of thought, and seem an abbreviated edition of lii. 7—16 (= 2 K. xxv. 4—12).

11—13. O′ *vacat.* This passage we may also consider a gloss, though not with the same absolute confidence as that which precedes. According to lii. 12 Nebuzar-adan did not enter Jerusalem till four weeks later than this time, while xxxviii. [xlv.] 28 seems to imply that immediately upon the taking of the city the prophet was set free. See further discussion of the question in Gi. רַבֵּי (*v.* 13) is itself a word which in this sense rarely, if ever, occurs as early as Jeremiah's time. Comp. xli. 1.

14. לְהוֹצִאֵהוּ אֶל־הַבָּיִת. *καὶ ἐξήγαγον αὐτόν.* הב׳ sounds obscure, but must mean Jer.'s house. It is probably a gloss, embodying some tradition.

16. וְהָיוּ...הַהוּא. O' *vacat.*

xl. [xlvii.] 1. יְרוּשָׁלַםִ ו. O' *vacat.*

3. וַיָּבֵא. O' *vacat.*

וְהָיָה...הַזֶּה. O' *vacat.*

4. הַיּוֹם. O' *vacat.*

בֹּא וְאָשִׂים. (ℵAQ *ἧκε*) *καὶ* (A om. *κ.*) *θήσω.*

4, 5. וְאִם־רַע...וְשֻׁבָה. *εἰ δὲ μή, ἀπότρεχε* (ℵQ ins. *καὶ*) *ἀνάστρεψον* (A *εἰ δὲ μή, ἀπόστρεψον καὶ ἀπότρεχε*). We may take this to represent an original לכה, וְאִם לֹא לְכָה שֻׁבָה becoming חֲדַל (comp. Zech. xi. 12), and the negative amplified into רַע...בָּבֶל by way of harmonizing with the earlier part of the *v.* הלך is rendered by *ἀποτρ.* xxxvii. [xliv.] 9. The remainder of *v.* 4 in M.T. was suggested by Gen. xiii. 9, while the words וְעוֹדֶנּוּ לֹא־יָשׁוּב are a picturesque gloss.

5. בְּעָרֵי. *ἐν γῇ* (באר׳); to be preferred.

הָעָם...בְּעֵינֶיךָ. *τοῦ λαοῦ ἐν γῇ Ἰούδα· εἰς ἅπαντα τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου*, but ℵ* *τοῦ λ. εἰς πάντα τὰ ἀγ. ἐν γῇ* (ℵ¹ om. *γῇ*); Q* *τοῦ λ. εἰς π. τ. ἀγ. ἐν.*

אֲרֻחָה ו. O' *vacat* (Q *ἐστιατορίαν καί*).

7. וְנָשִׁים...הָאָרֶץ. *καὶ γυναῖκας αὐτῶν.* וּמִדַּלַּת הא׳ seem to have been suggested by lii. 16.

8. וְיוֹנָתָן בְּנֵי. *υἱός.* Thus "Jonathan...scheint nur ein Doppelgänger seines Bruders," Gi. He appears no more here nor in M.T. or O′ in 2 K. xxv. Another trace of his absence from the earliest text remains in the fact that בְּנֵי is represented in Targ. by a singular. So also many MSS. in Kenn. and de Rossi.

9. מֵעֲבוֹד. *ἀπὸ προσώπου* (אA ins. *τῶν*) *παίδων*; reading מֵעַבְדֵי, which is found in 2 K. xxv. 24. It is remarkable that there O′ seem to have read מֵעֵבֶר, rendering *πάροδον.*

10. יֹשֵׁב. O′ adds *ἐναντίον ὑμῶν* (Q om.).

12. וַיָּשֻׁבוּ...שָׁם. O′ *vacat.*

מְאֹד. O′ adds *καὶ ἔλαιον* (from *v.* 10).

15. לָמָּה יַכְּכָה נֶּפֶשׁ. *μὴ* (AQ add *ποτε*) *πατάξῃ σου ψυχήν*; freely.

xli. [xlviiii.] 1. וְרַבֵּי הַמֶּלֶךְ. O′ *vacat*; probably a gloss. For רַבֵּי see on xxxix. 13.

2. בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם...אֹתוֹ. O′ *vacat.*

3. אִתּוֹ אֶת־גְּדַלְיָהוּ. *μετ' αὐτοῦ.*

אֵת אַנְשֵׁי...יִשְׁמָעֵאל. O′ *vacat.*

5. מִשִּׁלוֹ. *καὶ* (Q om. *κ.*) *ἀπὸ Σαλήμ* (A *Σαλώμ*).

שָׁלֵם is mentioned as עִיר שְׁכֶם in M.T. of Gen. xxxiii. 18, but perhaps 'שׁ there is not a proper name. See Cheyne on the present verse. Wo. (pp. 254 f.) adduces the Genesis passage to confirm O′'s reading here. But the influence of a passage doubtless familiar to Alexandrian scholars may have induced the rendering Σαλήμ here, and A's variant strengthens this view.

6. הֹלֵךְ הָלֹךְ וּבֹכֶה. (A καὶ) αὐτοὶ ἐπορεύοντο καὶ ἔκλαιον (הלכ׳ הָלֹךְ וּבֹכִים). Failing to understand that apparent and not real mourning is meant, O′ felt bound to ascribe it to those who had just been spoken of as κοπτόμενοι. Cor. (p. 73) strangely remarks in support of O′, "It is impossible to see any motive for Ishmael's weeping."

7. הוּא...אִתּוֹ. O′ *vacat.*

8. בָם. ἐκεῖ (שָׁם); but Q om.

9. אֵת כָּל־פִּגְרֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים. πάντας. Gi. (p. xxxi) denies that M.T. is a gloss.

בְּיַד־גְּדַלְיָהוּ. φρέαρ μέγα (בּוֹר גָּדֹל). The Heb. is scarcely intelligible, while the Greek is probably right.

10. וַיִּשְׁבְּ. καὶ ἀπέστρεψεν (וַיָּשֶׁב).

וְאֶת־כָּל־הָעָם...בַּמִּצְפָּה. O′ *vacat.*

וַיִּשְׁבֵּם...נְתַנְיָה. O′ *vacat*, but Q marg. has καὶ

*ὤρθρισεν* (וַיַּשְׁכֵּם) *κτλ.*, which may be the original form of the gloss. For that reading Kenn. and de Rossi adduce several MSS.

12. הָאֲנָשִׁים. *τὸ στρατόπεδον αὐτῶν*; reading אֲנָשֵׁיהֶם.

13. וַיִּשְׂמָחוּ. O′ *vacat.*

14. וַיָּסֹבּוּ...מִן־הַמִּצְפָּה. O′ *vacat.*

וַיֵּלְכוּ אֶל־יוֹחָנָן בֶּן־קָרֵחַ. *πρὸς Ἰωανάν.*

15. מִפְּנֵי יוֹחָנָן. O′ *vacat.*

16. בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה...בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם. O′ *vacat.*

גְּבָרִים. *δυνατούς*; possibly reading the word as גִּבֹּרִים. Comp. xliii. [l.] 6, xliv. [li.] 20.

וָטַף. *καὶ τὰ λοιπά.* Comp. xliii. [l.] 6.

17. בְּגֵרוּת כִּמְהָם ק׳ (כִּמוֹהָם כ׳). *ἐν Γαβηρωχαμάα* (*χ sup. ras.* B$^{b}$), א *ἐν γῇ Βαηρωχαμά*, A *ἐν γῇ Βηρωθχαμαάμ*, Q* *ἐν γῇ Βαρωθχαμαάμ.* All these, M.T. included, are doubtless corruptions of the original. Gi. conjectures the first word to have been גִּדְרוֹת. So Aq., and Josephus, whose words (*Ant.* x. 9. 5) are "*εἴς τινα τόπον, μάνδραν λεγόμενον.*"

xlii. [xlix.] 1. וִיזַנְיָה בֶּן־הוֹשַׁעְיָה. *καὶ Ἀζαρίας υἱὸς Μαασαίου* (א* *Ἀνανίου*, א$^{c.a}$Q *Ὠσαίου*, A *Μασαίου*). *Ἀζαρ.*, as in xliii. [l.] 2, where M.T. itself has עֲזַרְיָה, is probably right. M.T. may be

due to the idea that the names of captains should correspond as closely as possible here to those given in xl. [xlvii.] 8. M*aaσ*. is as in xliii. 2, where M.T. is as here.

2. בַּעֲדֵנוּ. O′ *vacat.*

9. אֱלֹהֵי...לְפָנָיו. O′ *vacat.*

10. אִם־שׁוֹב תֵּשְׁבוּ. *ἐὰν καθίσαντες καθίσητε* (reading יָשׁוֹב).

12. וְרִחַם. *καὶ ἐλεήσω*; so וְהֵשִׁיב, *καὶ ἐπιστρέψω*. Apparently the Heb. words were read as infin. abs., and so considered as carrying on the person of אֶתֵּן.

14. לֵאמֹר לֹא. O′ *vacat.* It is almost too vivid for a gloss, and was probably omitted by O′, through their failure to understand the construction of the solitary לֹא.

15. שְׁאֵרִית יְהוּדָה. O′ *vacat.*

שׂוֹם תְּשִׂמוּן. *δῶτε.* See on xxiii. 39.

17. הָאֲנָשִׁים. *οἱ ἄνθρωποι* (Q *οἱ ἄνδρες*). O′ adds *καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀλλογενεῖς*, as though reading וְכָל־הַזָּרִים. This was perhaps suggested to them (so Gi.) by הַזֵּדִים of xliii. 2, although it is scarcely probable, as the Greek for that word (see note) survives for us only in Q.

וּבַדָּבֶר. O′ *vacat.* See on xxxii. 24, xxxviii. 2.

שָׂרִיד וּפָלִיט. *σωζόμενος*; so for פ׳ וש׳ in xliv. [li.] 14, *σεσωσμένος*.

18. וְחֲמָתִי. O′ *vacat.*

לְאָלָה וּלְשַׁמָּה. *εἰς ἄβατον* (א* *Αἴγυπτον*) *καὶ* (א* om. *καὶ*) *ὑποχείριοι*; thus omitting לא׳. *καὶ ὑπ.* may well be a gloss.

19. דִּבֶּר יְהוָה. *ἃ ἐλάλησεν Κύριος*. Probably the Heb. has early lost an opening הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר through an error of eye. For the formula see x. 1, xlv. 1, xlvi. 13, l. 1. O′, feeling the abruptness, supplied the relative. Vulg. has *Verbum Domini.*

כִּי...הַיּוֹם. O′ *vacat;* through confusion of eye.

20. הִתְעֵיתֶם ק׳. *ἐπονηρεύσασθε*; reading הֲרֵעֹתֶם.

אֱלֹהֵינוּ כֵּן הַגֶּד־לָנוּ וְ. O′ *vacat.*

21. וָאַגִּד...הַיּוֹם. O′ *vacat.*

אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וּלְכֹל. O′ *vacat.* Gi.'s view that O′ purposely omitted ולכל is unlikely, as thereby they would have wantonly made their rendering harsher.

22. יָדֹעַ תֵּדְעוּ כִּי. O′ *vacat.*

וּבַדָּבָר. O′ *vacat.* See *v.* 17.

xliii. [l.] 2. אֲזַרְיָה בֶן־הוֹשַׁעְיָה. *Ἀζαρίας υἱὸς Μαασσαίου* (B[ab] *Μνασσαίου*, א* *Μασέου*, א[c.a] *Μαασέου*, A *Μασαίου*, Q *Ὠσαίου*). See on xlii. 1.

הַזֵּדִים. O′ *vacat* (Q οἱ ὑπερήφανοι).

אֹמְרִים. οἱ εἴπαντες (א*A -πόντες, Q* εἶπαν). We can recover the art. in M.T., if (with Gi.) we emend to וְהַמֹּרִים, *and the rebellious.* That O′'s rendering is consistent with such a reading, in other words that the loss of the א, which is involved in referring the word to אמר, would not be a very serious difficulty with them, we gather from such passages as vii. 10 (see note there) and xlix. 8 [xxix. 9].

אַתָּה מְדַבֵּר. O′ *vacat.*

אֱלֹהֵינוּ. πρὸς ἡμᾶς; reading אֵלֵינוּ. M.T. however is on the whole the more probable, when we compare the language of xlii. [xlix.] 20.

5. מִכָּל־הַגּוֹיִם...שָׁם. O′ *vacat.*

יְהוּדָה. O′ *vacat* (A Ἰούδα).

6. אֶת־הַגְּבָרִים. τοὺς δυνατοὺς ἄνδρας. See on xli. 16.

וְאֶת־הַטַּף. καὶ τὰ λοιπά (A καὶ τὰ νήπια κ. τ. λ.; Q τὰ νήπ. λ.). So in xli. [xlviii.] 16.

9. בַּמֶּלֶט בַּמַּלְבֵּן אֲשֶׁר בְּפֶתַח. ἐν (א ἐπὶ) προθύροις, ἐν πύλῃ. O′ have omitted מֶלֶט (which occurs here only), perhaps as being unknown to them. We may however adopt Gi.'s suggestion that they read בַּלָּט, with Aq. Symm. Theod., who

have *ἐν (τῷ) κρυφίῳ* or *ἐν ἀποκρύφοις*; so (with ast.) SH. and MSS. 88 and (without ast.) 22, 36, and others. If O′ read thus, they may have considered the word as already sufficiently expressed by their *κατάκρυψον*. מַלְבֵּן is a subst. which occurs elsewhere only in Nah. iii. 14 (*πλίνθον*) and ? 2 S. xii. 31 (*τοῦ πλινθείου*). MS. 88 with ast. (so Q^marg.^ *ἐν τῷ π.*) has *ἐν πλινθίῳ* in the present passage. Probably (so Gi.) it is a corruption of מִלִּפְנֵי, and stood immediately before פֶּתַח. After the word had thus been corrupted to a subst., אֲשֶׁר בְּ was inserted for the sake of the sense, and O′, finding this form of text, omitted מ׳ and took אֲשֶׁר as though it were שַׁעַר misplaced.

10. עֲבָדִי. O′ *vacat*. See on xxv. 9.

וְשַׂמְתִּי. *καὶ θήσει*; rightly, as the following נָטָה shews. M.T. arose from the influence of לָקַחְתִּי.

טָמַנְתִּי. *κατέκρυψας* (א* -*ψα*). M.T. is probably right, as the reading from which the other is more likely to have come. Not so however Gi. or Cor. (p. 73).

שַׁפְרִירוֹ ק׳. *τὰ ὅπλα* (AQ add *αὐτοῦ*). The word is *ἅπ. λεγ.* and was doubtless not familiar. The present is not the only instance of a strange use of *ὅπλα* in this Book. See li. 12.

12. וְהִצַּתִּי. *καὶ καύσει.* See on וְשַׂמְתִּי in *v.* 10.

וְעָטָה. *καὶ φθειριεῖ* (A *φθερ.*); and so יַעְטֶה, *φθειρίζει* (A *φθερ.*); a decidedly unsuccessful guess, although Cor. (p. 73) confidently defends it. O′ failed to conjecture any suitable application of a word which must in its ordinary sense have been familiar. For Aq. and Symm. (? *καὶ ἐξερευνήσει τοὺς βώλους Αἰγύπτου*) see Field's full note.

13. בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ. *Ἡλίου πόλεως τοὺς ἐν Ὤν* (AQ* *ἐν Ἐνών*); a double rendering.

אֲשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם. O′ *vacat;* a gloss, to distinguish from Beth-shemesh in Palestine (so Gi.).

וְאֶת־בָּתֵּי אֱלֹהֵי מִצְרַיִם. *καὶ τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν.* The form in M.T. arose through *v.* 12.

xliv. [li.] 1. וּבְנֹף. O′ *vacat.*

2. הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה. O′ *vacat.*

וְאֵין בָּהֶם יוֹשֵׁב. *ἀπὸ ἐνοίκων* (AQ* *ἐνοικούντων*); as though reading מֵאֵין י׳.

3. לַעֲבֹד. O′ *vacat.* The occurrence of the word in this connexion (contrast *v.* 8) and its construction (לאל) are in themselves suspicious.

הֵמָּה...וַאֲבֹתֵיכֶם. O′ *vacat.*

6. בְּעָרֵי. *ἐν πύλαις.* Considering the number of cases, in which O′'s rendering suggests the loss

of a letter from the present Heb. text, we may decide to consider that they here read בִּשְׁעָרֵי, rather than that *πύλαις* is an error for *πόλεσιν*. If the latter had been O′'s rendering (now found, according to Holmes and Parsons, only in MS. 106; so Compl.), there would have been the less reason for the corruption, as בְּעָרֵי is rendered by *ἐν πόλεσιν* (without a variant in H. and P.) in *v.* 17.

8. לְמַעַן הַכְרִית לָכֶם. *ἵνα ἐκκοπῆτε*; reading doubtless לְמ׳ הַכְרִיתְכֶם. The prep. in M.T. comes from *v.* 7.

9. נָשָׁיו. *τῶν ἀρχόντων ὑμῶν*. Read (with Gi.) שָׂרָיו, comparing the language of *vv.* 17, 21, viii. 1.

וְאֵת רָעֹתֵיכֶם. O′ *vacat.*

וְאֵת רָעֹת נְשֵׁיכֶם. *καὶ τῶν κακῶν τῶν γυναικῶν ὑμῶν*; but, as Gi. points out, this may be a gloss by way of correcting *ἀρχόντων* above, and thus the words may not have a rightful place in either text.

10. לֹא דֻכְּאוּ. *καὶ οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο*; freely.

וְלֹא יָרְאוּ. O′ *vacat.*

בְּתוֹרָתִי וּ. O′ *vacat.*

לִפְנֵיכֶם וְ. O′ *vacat.*

11. בָּכֶם לְרָעָה. O′ *vacat.*

11, 12. אֶת־כָּל־יְהוּדָה וְלָקַחְתִּי אֶת־שְׁאֵרִית. *πάντας τοὺς καταλοίπους.*

12. יְהוּדָה...בְּאֶרֶץ. O′ *vacat.*

בַּחֶרֶב (2°)...יָמֻתוּ. O′ *vacat.* Most of this is a gloss suggested by xlii. [xlix.] 17.

לְאָלָה וּ. O′ *vacat.*

13. וּבַדָּבֶר. O′ *vacat* (AQ *καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ*). See on xlii. 17.

14. פָּלִיט וְשָׂרִיד. *σεσωσμένος.* See on xlii. 17.

15. לֵאלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים. O′ *vacat* (AQ *θεοῖς ἑτέροις*).

הָעֹמְדוֹת. O′ *vacat.*

17. לִמְלֶכֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם. *τῇ βασιλίσσῃ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.* See on vii. 18.

18. וְהַסֵּךְ־לָהּ נְסָכִים. O′ *vacat.*

19. לְהַעֲצִבָה. O′ *vacat.* According to Gi. (p. xxx) the word was unintelligible to them. It probably means, *to represent her* (by the shape of the cakes. Comp. יָדֶיךָ עִצְּבוּנִי, Job x. 8). Vulg. *ad colendum eam*, Aq. *ἐν κακώσει* (or *εἰς κάκωσιν*), Symm. *τῷ γλυπτῷ αὐτῆς.*

20. הַגְּבָרִים. *τοῖς δυνατοῖς.* See on xli. 16.

21. הַקִּטֵּר. *τοῦ θυμιάματος*; as though reading קְטֹרֶת. The M.T. is *ἅπ. λεγ.* and suspicious.

קִטַּרְתֶּם. *ἐθυμιάσαμεν*; but Bᵃᵇא* *ἐθυμίασαν*, א¹Q *ἐθυμιάσατε*, A *ἐθυμιάσατο*.

אַתֶּם. O′ *vacat;* but they may have found אֹתָהּ, referring to קְטֹרֶת. See above.

22. יוּכַל. *ἠδύνατο*; reading יָכֹל.

מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב. O′ *vacat.*

23. עַל־כֵּן. *καί.*

כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה. O′ *vacat.*

24. כָּל־יְהוּדָה...מִצְרָיִם. O′ *vacat.*

25. אַתֶּם וּנְשֵׁיכֶם. *ὑμεῖς* (א adds *αἱ*) *γυναῖκες*, as though reading אַתֵּנָה הַנָּשִׁים. This is better, on account of the gender of the following תְּדַבֵּרְנָה. It is not absolutely necessary that the three masc. affixes which follow should be altered. Comp. Exod. i. 16 (וָחָיָה), ii. 17 (וַיְגָרְשׁוּם and צֹאנָם); so Cant. vi. 9 *bis;* Ruth i. 8, 9, 11, 13, 22.

2° אֶת־נִדְרֵיכֶם. O′ *vacat.*

27. עַד־כְּלוֹתָם. *ἐὰν* (Bᵃᵇ אAQ *ἕως ἂν*) *ἐκλίπωσιν* (A *-λείπ.*).

28. מִן־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם. O′ *vacat.*

מִמֶּנִּי וּמֵהֶם. O′ *vacat.* The earlier form was doubtless מ׳ או מ׳.

29. 2° בַּמָּקוֹם...עֲלֵיכֶם. O′ *vacat;* by an error of eye.

30. פַּרְעֹה. O′ *vacat.*

xlv. 3 [li. 33]. יָגוֹן עַל־מַכְאֹבִי. **κόπον ἐπίπονόν μοι** (Q **μου**). We should rather read (so SH.) **κόπον ἐπὶ πόνον μου** with Compl.

4 [li. 34]. וְאֵת כָּל־...הִיא. O′ *vacat.*

xlvi. 1 [xxv. 14]. אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָֹה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא עַל־הַגּוֹיִם. ^A **ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἰερεμίας ἐπὶ τὰ** (א* om. **τὰ**) **ἔθνη**. See on xxv. 13 [14].

3 [xxvi.]. מָגֵן. **ὅπλα**. So *v.* 9, and in 1 K. x. 17, xiv. 26, 27, and elsewhere.

5 [xxvi.]. רָאִיתִי. O′ *vacat;* thus saving us from the difficulty, or according to Schwally (l.c. p. 191, note), the impossibility of taking מַדּוּעַ as equivalent to מָה.

וּמָנוֹס. **φυγῇ**. 'מ elsewhere is *a place of refuge* (Ps. cxlii. 5; Job xi. 20), not the act of flight. If therefore we are to accept O′'s rendering (so A.V. and R.V. "are fled apace") we should read, as they probably did, the infin. abs.

7 [xxvi.]. מֵימָיו. **ὕδωρ** (א* om.); perhaps by confusion of eye with the מַיִם of the next *v.*

8 [xxvi.]. מִצְרַיִם. **ὕδατα Αἰγύπτου**; perhaps meant as Midrashic (comp. the figure as used in Is. viii. 7), and not as translating a variant on the מֵימָיו of *v.* 7.

וְכַנְּהָרוֹת יִתְגֹּעֲשׁוּ מָיִם. O′ *vacat*. The words are wanted for the parallelism. O′ may have omitted them under the impression that they were an erroneous repetition.

עִיר וְ. O′ *vacat* (Q πόλιν καί).

9 [xxvi.]. וְהִתְהֹלְלוּ. *παρασκευάσατε* (A *κατεσκ.*, AQ* pref. *καί*). They have been more successful in xxv. 16 [xxxii. 2], *καὶ μανήσονται*, and li. [xxviii.] 7, *ἐσαλεύθησαν*.

2° תֹּפְשֵׂי. O′ *vacat;* but see next note.

דֹּרְכֵי. O′ pref. *ἀνάβητε*; but this may be a corruption of *ἀναλάβετε*, as a rendering of תֹּפְשֵׂי. 'ת occurs again with קֶשֶׁת in Am. ii. 15.

10 [xxvi.]. חֶרֶב. *ἡ* (א om. *ἡ*) *μάχαιρα* Κυρίου (Q om. K.).

בְּאֶרֶץ. *ἀπὸ γῆς* ('מא). For other examples of the confusion of ב and מ see on xx. 17.

11 [xxvi.]. בְּתוּלַת בַּת־מִצְרָיִם. For examples of this construction, see on v. 24.

12 [xxvi.]. קְלוֹנֵךְ. *φωνήν σου* (קוֹלֵךְ); most probably rightly, as better suiting the parallelism. For other examples of the loss of נ see on iv. 1.

14 [xxvi.]. בְּמִצְרַיִם וְהַשְׁמִיעוּ. O′ *vacat*.

בְנֹף. *εἰς Μέμφιν*. See on ii. 16.

וּבְתַחְפַּנְחֵס. O′ *vacat* (Q *hab.*).

סְבִיבֶיךָ. *τὴν σμίλακά σου*. In xlviii. [xxxi.]

17, 39 O′ had no difficulty in rendering סְבִיבָיו by *κυκλόθεν αὐτοῦ* and *τοῖς κύκλῳ αὐτῆς*. Their reading here was probably סְבִבְךָ from סֹבֶךְ. The only occurrence indeed of this last word in M.T. of the Book (iv. 7; where see note) does not here help us, as O′ may have had a different reading there. Nevertheless it seems better to conjecture that they thus translated somewhat freely in this passage, than that their Heb. text was read by them with a nearer approach to the sound of this Greek word, and that they were thereby led to adopt it as their rendering. For examples of this latter tendency see iv. 31, ix. 4 [5], xlviii. [xxxi.] 26.

15 [xxvi.]. נִסְחַף. *ἔφυγεν ἀπὸ σοῦ* (אAQ om. *ἀπὸ σοῦ*) *ὁ* *Ἆπις*; reading נָס חֹף. As Cheyne (*ad loc.*) remarks, "The authority of the Egyptian-Jewish version in a prophecy relative to Egypt is not slight." סחף, which in M.T. is found elsewhere only Prov. xxviii. 3, is Aramaic, and in the Targ. of Prov. x. 3 represents הדף. Considering then that this last root occurs in the parallel clause here, the reading נִסְחַף is a very natural error.

אַבִּירֶיךָ לֹא עָמַד. *ὁ μόσχος ὁ ἐκλεκτός σου οὐκ ἔμεινεν*; a duplicate rendering of an original אַבִּירְךָ. That the word should be sing. is shewn by what follows. If anything were needed to

confirm this emendation, it would be found in the occurrence of the roots נוס (see preceding note) and עמד in close connexion in *v.* 21.

16 [xxvi.]. הִרְבָּה כּוֹשֵׁל. *καὶ* (Q* om. *καὶ*) *τὸ πλῆθός σου ἠσθένησεν*; reading, according to Gi., וְעֶרְבְּךָ. But 'ע is elsewhere rendered by *σύμμικτος* (xxv. 20, 24 [xxxii. 6, 10], l. [xxvii.] 37). It is thus more likely that they recognised the root רבה (Schwally, l.c. p. 193 proposes רִבְּךָ), reading the next word כָּשַׁל.

חֶרֶב הַיּוֹנָה. See on xxv. 38.

17 [xxvi.]. קָרְאוּ שָׁם. *καλέσατε τὸ ὄνομα* (קִרְאוּ שֵׁם). This gives a much better sense. So Pesh. ܫܡܗ, and Vulg. *nomen*.

פַּרְעֹה. *Φαραὼ Νεχαώ.*

שָׁאוֹן. *Σαών, desolation,* "the fittest name for the fallen monarch." So Cheyne (*ad loc.*), who for this naming with a symbolic sense compares xx. 3, Is. xxx. 7.

שָׁאוֹן הֶעֱבִיר הַמּוֹעֵד. *Σαὼν Ἐσβεὶ* (AQ *Ἐσβὶ*) *Ἐμωήδ.* Gi. suggests that for 'הע they read הִשְׁבִּיחַ or הִשְׁבִּיחָה.

18 [xxvi.]. הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. *Κύριος ὁ θεός* (Q om. *ὁ θ.*).

כְּתָבוֹר. *ὡς τὸ Ἰταβύριον.* So in Hos. v. 1, and in Jos. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 1. 8, *Ant.* v. 1. 22, xiii. 15. 4.

19 [xxvi.]. וְנִצְּתָה. *καὶ κληθήσεται Οὐαί*; a paraphrase of the text, either as it stands, or with the letters צ and ת transposed. See on ii. 15, ix. 9 [10].

20 [xxvi.]. קֶרֶץ. *ἀπόσπασμα*; Vulg. *stimulator.* The Heb. is *ἅπ. λεγ.*

בָּא בָא. *ἦλθεν ἐπ' αὐτήν* (בָּהּ); doubtless rightly. So Pesh. (ܐܬܐ ܥܠܝܗ) and Vulg. (*veniet ei*).

22 [xxvi.]. כַּנָּחָשׁ יֵלֵךְ. *ὡς ὄφεως συρίζοντος* (A* vid *-τες*); evidently an early error for *σύροντος* (so Spohn). For *σύρω* used of serpents comp. Deut. xxxii. 24; Mic. vii. 17.

בְּחַיִל. *ἐν ἄμμῳ* (בְּחוֹל).

23 [xxvi.]. יֵחָקֵר. *εἰκασθῇ.* Spohn suggests *ἐτασθῇ.*

25 [xxvi.]. אָמַר יה'. See on xv. 11.

מִנֹּא. *τὸν* (Q om. *τ.*) *υἱὸν αὐτῆς*; reading בְּנָהּ (or possibly נִינָהּ). For confusion of ב and מ see on xx. 17. The מ itself however (see Nah. iii. 8) is probably an accretion, suggested by the מ of the previous word.

2° וְעַל־מִצְרַיִם...וְעַל־פַּרְעֹה. O' *vacat*, owing to a confusion of eye, through the recurrence of אֶל־פ'.

26 [xxvi.]. O' *vacat.* The expression כִּימֵי קֶדֶם is at least suspicious in the mouth of Jeremiah. The whole is doubtless a gloss, inserted by one who

desired somewhat to soften the dismal forecast for Egypt, especially as words of corresponding comfort follow for his own people. Similar glosses occur xlviii. [xxxi.] 47, xlix. [xxx.] 6. In xlix. 39 [xxv. 19] this gloss has effected a lodgment in both texts.

27, 28 [xxvi.]. These *vv.* in M.T. are substantially identical with xxx. [xxxvii.] 10, 11, which are lacking in O′. See on xi. 7.

27 [xxvi.]. וְשַׁאֲנַן. *καὶ ὑπνώσει* (א* om.). Comp. xlviii. [xxxi.] 11, *ἀνεπαύσατο*.

28 [xxvi.]. אָנִי. O′ add *ἡ ἀπτόητος καὶ τρυφερὰ παρεδόθη*; a gloss erroneously introduced from xxvii. [l.] 2, which in O′ immediately follows.

xlvii. [xxix.] 1. אֲשֶׁר...הַנָּבִיא. O′ *vacat*.

בְּטֶרֶם...אֶת־עַזָּה. O′ *vacat*. If this, like the other prophecies against foreign nations, is (as seems clearly shewn by xxv. 1, 13) to be assigned to the 4th year of Jehoiakim (B.C. 604) that date conflicts with these words of M.T., inasmuch as Herod. (ii. 159) makes Necho capture Gaza (*Κάδυτις*) after the battle of Megiddo (c. B.C. 608). Cor. (p. 55), though not noticing this discrepancy of date, points out that the M.T. "can hardly have formed part of the original text, since from the whole style of description...and from the analogy of the other oracles forming part of this group, Nebuchadnezzar is the only enemy with whom the Philistines can here be threatened."

3. מִקּוֹל שַׁעֲטַת פַּרְסוֹת אַבִּירָיו. *ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὁρμῆς αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ὅπλων* (א* *καὶ*) *τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.* Thus O′ read or understood a מִן before 'פ, and did not see the reference of 'אב to steeds. See on viii. 16.

4. אֶת־פְּלִשְׁתִּים. O′ *vacat;* a gloss on the following words.

שְׁאֵרִית אִי כַפְתּוֹר. *τοὺς* (A *τὰς*) *καταλοίπους τῶν νήσων.* This suggests that O′ closed the *v.* with (אי״ =) אִיִּים, and that 'כפ is a gloss, owing to the connexion of the Philistines with that place (Deut. ii. 23; Am. ix. 7). Gi. on the contrary thinks that they omitted it from the geographical difficulty involved in taking it to mean Cappadocia, as do Aq. Theod. Targ. (קַפּוּטְקָאֵי) Pesh. Vulg.

5. נִדְמְתָה. *ἀπερίφη*; reading ר for ד. Comp. viii. 14. Vulg., taking M.T. as though from דום or דמם, has *conticuit.*

עִמְקָם. 'Ἐνακείμ; probably rightly, M.T. being harsh. Aq. (*τῶν κοιλάδων*) read עֲנָקִים. Similarly in 1 Chr. xii. 15 we should correct M.T. to הָעֲנָקִים. Comp. the statement in Josh. xi. 22. Krochmel (quoted by Cheyne *ad loc.*) proposes עֶקְרוֹן.

6. הוֹי. O′ *vacat*, also connecting the last three words of *v.* 5 with חֶרֶב לַי׳, to which the reflexive sense of 'תתג is unsuited.

וְרֹמִּי. *καὶ ἐπάρθητι* (וְרֻמִּי).

7. תִּשְׁקֹטִי. *ἡσυχάσει* (תִּשְׁקֹט), but A *-σεις*. M.T.'s error was caused by the preceding תִּשְׁקֹטִי.

וְאֶל־חוֹף הַיָּם. *καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς παραθαλασσίους*. For concrete in place of abstract see on xxiv. 5.

שָׁם יְעָדָהּ. *ἐπὶ τὰς καταλοίπους, ἐπεγερθῆναι*; reading for the first word שְׁאָר, and in the second seeing the root עִיר, *to be hot, excited*, which appears as a substantival form in xv. 8; (Hos. xi. 9).

xlviii. [xxxi.] 1. הֹבִישָׁה. O' *vacat.*

הַמִּשְׂגָּב וָחָתָּה. Ἀμὰθ (א τὸ κραταίωμα; A Ἀμ. τὸ κρ.) *καὶ* Ἀγὰθ (אAQ *καὶ ἡττήθη*). O''s MS. seems to have been in some way defective. The testimony of Aq. Theod. is not clear. Symm. has *τὸ κραταίωμα* (? *καὶ ἡττήθη*). That 'מ should be joined with fem. verbs renders M.T. also suspicious. Gi. proposes some such emendation as עָר מוֹאָב.

2. תְּהִלַּת מוֹאָב. *ἰατρεία* (Q *ἀγαυρίαμα*) Μωάβ (A *ἐν* M.). They read תְּעָלַת, although this word is rendered by *ὠφελία* (*ὠφέλεια*) xxx. [xxxvii.] 13, xlvi. [xxvi.] 11.

בְּחֶשְׁבּוֹן. O' pref. *ἀγαυρίαμα* (Q om.); a gloss corrective of the preceding *ἰατρεία*.

לְכוּ וְנַכְרִיתֶנָּה. *ἐκόψαμεν* (Q *δεῦτε καὶ ἐκκόψωμεν*) *αὐτήν*.

גַּם־מַדְמֵן תִּדֹּמִּי. *καὶ παῦσιν παύσεται.* So Vulg. *ergo silens conticesces*, but Symm. (probably) *ἔτι, Μαδμηνά, σιωπήσῃ.*

3. צְעָקָה. *κεκραγότων.* For concrete in place of abstract see on xxiv. 5.

4. הִשְׁמִיעוּ זְעָקָה (צְעוֹרֶיהָ כ׳) צְעִירֶיהָ ק׳. *ἀναγγείλατε εἰς Ζόγορα*; very possibly rightly. Aq. (and probably) Symm. support M.T. as to צ׳. "Zoar and Horonaim are mentioned together, not only in *v.* 34, but also in Is. xv. 5." Cheyne (*ad loc.*). See next note. The ק׳ is suggested by xlix. 20, l. 45.

5. מַעֲלֵה (הַלֻּחוֹת כ׳) הַלֻּחִית (ק׳) בִּבְכִי. *ἐπλήσθη Ἀλὼθ ἐν κλαυθμῷ*; thus reading the first word מָלְאָה, taking the כ׳ as a proper name, and including the next word in the clause (against M.T.). The *v.* is almost identical with Is. xv. 5, which supports the ק׳.

בֶּכִי כִּי. *κλαίων.* The כִּי looks like dittography, and O′ considered it as such. Is. xv. 5 has simply בוֹ, which probably is the original reading here also.

בְּמוֹרַד. *ἐν ὁδῷ*; loosely.

צָרֵי. O′ *vacat.* The word is absent from Is. xv. 5 (see last note).

6. כַּעֲרוֹעֵר. *ὥσπερ ὄνος ἄγριος*; reading rightly כְּעָרוֹד.

7. בְּמַעֲשַׂיִךְ וּבְאוֹצְרוֹתַיִךְ. *ἐν ὀχυρώμασίν σου* (בְּמְצָדוֹתַיִךְ; see *v.* 41). So Vulg. *in munitionibus tuis.* 'מצ was easily corrupted into 'אצ, while the first word is an insertion referring to the idol Chemosh mentioned later in the *v.* So Cor. (pp. 55 f.). Compare for 'מע in this sense, מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי אָדָם, Deut. iv. 28 and elsewhere.

8. וְעִיר לֹא. *οὐ μὴ* (AQ pref. *καὶ πόλις*); apparently an accidental omission.

9. צִיץ. *σημεῖα* (A -*εῖον*); reading or understanding נֵס (comp. iv. 6) or better (so Gi.) צִיֻּן (xxxi. 21), *a waymark.* Aq. *ἄνθος*, Symm. *βλάστημα.*

נָצֹא תֵּצֵא. *ἀφῇ ἀφθήσεται* (AQ *ἀναφθ.*); as though from a root equivalent to נצת = יצת, *to kindle.* Aq. *ἀνθοῦσα ἐξελεύσεται*, Symm. (better) *ἐξόδῳ ἐξελ.* and so Targ. This makes נצא = יצא, and such a root would suit well enough צִיֻּן (see last note). The neighbourhood however of עָרֶיהָ here suggests that we should emend (so Schwally, l.c. p. 197) in accordance with iv. 7, to נָצֹה תִּצֶּה.

מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב בָּהֵן. *πόθεν ἔνοικος αὐτῇ* (אQ *αὐτῆς*; A *ἀπὸ ἐνοικούντων αὐτάς*); an unusual rendering. See iv. 7, 29, ix. 10 etc.

10. וְאָרוּר. O' *vacat.*

11. שַׁאֲנָן. *ἀνεπαύσατο.* Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 27, *ὑπνώσει.*

וְשֹׁקֵט. *καὶ πεποιθώς.* Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 27, *ἡσυχάσει.*

אֶל־שְׁמָרָיו. *ἐπὶ τῇ δοξῇ αὐτοῦ*; apparently connecting the subst. with שֵׁם. In its two other occurrences they either ignore it, rendering very loosely (Is. xxv. 6) or translate *φυλάγματα* (Zeph. i. 12).

12. וְנִבְלֵיהֶם. *καὶ τὰ κέρατα* (a corruption of *κεράμια*) *αὐτοῦ*; reading וְנִבְלָיו. The pl. aff. of M.T. is unaccountable. Aq. has *αὐτοῦ*, but Symm. *αὐτῶν.*

13. מִבְטַחָם. *ἐλπίδος αὐτῶν, πεποιθότες ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.* מב' appears as *ἐλπ.* in ii. 37 [36]. Here we have a double rendering.

15. וְעָרֶיהָ עָלָה. *πόλις αὐτοῦ.* The word following וע' seems to have been early dubious. Accordingly O′ omitted it, while M.T. read עָלָה in spite of the lack of grammatical concord. Either ע' is to be accepted in spite of this, and explained, *are gone up in one mass of smoke* (in which case O′'s omission was occasioned by failure to understand it), or, which seems more likely, the verb governed by עָרֶיהָ early became defective, and was supplied conjecturally by M.T. Vulg. is

*ascenderunt*. To read the first word of the *v.* שֹׁדֵד is tempting, and has the further advantage that it saves us from making מוֹאָב of both genders. It does not however account for the difficulty which עָלָה causes, as discussed above.

נְאֻם...שְׁמוֹ. O′ *vacat*.

16. אֵיד. *ἡμέρα*. Gi. conjectures a misreading of the consecutive letters ידם, and nothing better than this seems forthcoming.

17. נֻדוּ. *κινήσατε*. So xviii. 16, but in xv. 5 *δειλιᾶν* is the verb used.

יֹדְעֵי. *ἔκδοτε*, but Q has *εἰδότες* and so MSS. 22, 23, 36, and others, and SH.

18. בַּצָּמָא. *ἐν ὑγρασίᾳ*. One text or the other seems corrupt. Gi. conjectures לָאָרֶץ, comparing Is. xlvii. 1. This does not however help us with *ὑγ*. Another hypothesis is that O′ read בבצא = בְּבִצָּה (see Job viii. 11, xl. 21), or that their original word was *ξηρασίᾳ*. SH. however agrees with their present reading.

בַּת־דִּיבוֹן. *Δαιβὼν* (א *Δεβών*, Q^a vid *Ἀδαιβών*, AQ pref. *θυγάτηρ*) *ἐκτρίβεται* (אQ *-βηται*; Q om.). בַּת is perhaps a duplication of the ending of יוֹשֶׁבֶת, which in O′ ends its clause. Hence Δ. was thought to lack a verb, and *ἐκτρ.* was supplied.

כִּי־שֹׁדֵד מוֹאָב עָלָה בָךְ שִׁחֵת מִבְצָרָיִךְ. *ὅτι*

ὤλετο Μωάβ· ἀνέβη εἰς σὲ λυμαινόμενος ὀχύρωμά (A -ματα) σου; thus reading שֹׁדֵד and apparently מִשְׁחַת.

19. וְנִמְלָטָה. *καὶ σωζόμενον*; Q *κ. ἀνασ.* (וְנִמְלָט).

20. חַתָּה. *συνετρίβη*. מוֹאָב being masc. elsewhere in the *v.*, we must read חַת, and consider that the ה crept in through the following one.

הֵילִילִי וּזְעָקִי ק'. *ὀλόλυξον* (Q -λυζε) *καὶ κέκραξον*; reading wrongly (with כ') the sing. fem. See last note.

21. וְאֶל־יַהְצָה. *καὶ* (ℵAQ pref. *ἐπὶ*) Ῥεφὰς (ℵ* Ῥαφάθ; Q Ἴασσα).

24. אֶרֶץ. O′ *vacat*.

25. וּזְרֹעוֹ. *καὶ τὸ ἐπίχειρον αὐτοῦ*. See on xxvii. 5.

26. בְּקִיאוֹ. *ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ*. The Heb. word is rightly translated Is. xix. 14; Prov. xxvi. 11. Here O′, failing to understand it, adopt the expedient of representing it by a Greek word of which its sound reminds them. See on xlvi. 14.

27. הַשְּׂחֹק. *εἰς γελοιασμόν*; reading, probably rightly, לִשְׂחֹק.

נִמְצָאָה כ'. *εὑρέθη* (but Q -θησαν); reading (with ק') נִמְצָא.

מִדֵּי דְבָרֶיךָ. O′ *vacat*; possibly, owing to their

not understanding the sense; but rather, the words were suggested by the מִדֵּי דַבְּרִי of xxxi. 20.

בּוֹ תִּתְנוֹדָד. *ἐπολέμεις αὐτόν*; reading תִּתְגּוֹרָר or תִּתְגָּרֶה. But M.T. is very possibly right in the sense of *shaking the head in mockery*. Comp. the Hiph. in xviii. 16.

28. עִזְבוּ. *κατέλιπον*; *-λειπ*. א[c.a] A (עָזְבוּ); and so for the imperatives that follow.

בְּעֶבְרֵי פִי־פָחַת. *ἐν πέτραις στόματι βοθύνου*. Πέτ. is perhaps a corruption of *πέρασιν*.

29. גֵּאֶה. *ὕβρισεν* (גָּאָה).

וְגַאֲוָתוֹ. O′ *vacat.*

וְרֻם. *καὶ ὑψώθη* (וְרָם).

30. עֶבְרָתוֹ. (A *τὰ*) *ἔργα αὐτοῦ*; reading עֲבֹדָתוֹ.

וְלֹא־כֵן בַּדָּיו לֹא־כֵן עָשׂוּ. *οὐχὶ τὸ ἱκανὸν αὐτῷ* (אAQ *αὐτοῦ*) *οὐχ οὕτως ἐποίησεν*; In Is. xvi. 6, which is substantially identical with this *v.* as far as לֹא כ׳ ב׳ בַּדָּיו, are connected, not as here separated, by the accents. Doubtless we should emend this *v.* accordingly. The last three words of M.T. are a gloss, although early enough to be recognised by O′. They read here בְּדַיוֹ, but evidently were quite as much at sea with regard to the meaning as they were in Is. l.c., where they

have ἡ μαντία σου. (See note on viii. 6.) Aq. has here (but see Field, and comp. his note on l. [xxvii.] 36, where O′ *vacat*) καὶ οὕτως τὰ ἔκλεκτα αὐτοῦ, and Symm. οὕτως ὁ βραχίων αὐτοῦ.

31. אֲיֵלִיל, אֶזְעָק. ὀλολύζετε, βοήσατε; perhaps to avoid expressions which might savour of anthropomorphism. See however on x. 19.

וּלְמוֹאָב. O′ *vacat*. The word hardly looks like a gloss. Gi. (p. xxxi) seems right in thinking that O′ deliberately omitted it.

אֶל־אַנְשֵׁי קִיר־חֶרֶשׂ. ἐπ' ἄνδρας κειράδας (A κιδάρας) αὐχμοῦ. אֲשִׁישֵׁי, as in Is. xvi. 7, may very well have been the original here also. The αὐχ. seems a duplicate rendering of 'ח, which is already represented in the transliteration κειρ. here and in *v.* 36. Vulg. *muri fictilis*; Aq. Symm. τοίχου ὀστρακίνου. It is *possible* however that κειρ. may be a rendering of קְרֵחִים, *bald-headed*, *shaven*.

יֶהְגֶּה. O′ *vacat*. If we hesitate to change to אֶהְגֶּה, we must consider the subject to be indefinite (*one will mourn*). Vulg. *lamentantes*, and so Targ. Pesh. have the plural. Theod. καὶ μελετήσει; Aq. Symm. καὶ μέλος ἐρεῖ.

32. מִבְּכִי. ὡς κλαυθμὸν (כִּבְכִי); thus pointing us to the reading בִּבְכִי found in the parallel passage, Is. xvi. 9. For confusion of ב and מ see on xx. 17.

עַד יָם יַעְזֵר. πόλεις (Bא* πόλις) Ἰαζήρ. The יָם is clearly an accidental repetition, but it may be earlier than O′. In that case they read עָרִים (with Ἰ. in apposition); otherwise עָרֵי.

שֹׁדֵד. ὄλεθρος; as in *v.* 8. In *v.* 3 it is (and more accurately) the rendering of שֹׁד. Is. l.c. has הֵידָד, of which שֹׁדֵד may be a corruption.

33. וּמִכַּרְמֶל. O′ *vacat*; taking כ׳ for a proper name (see on ii. 7), and so omitting it as geographically distant from the subject of the prophecy.

הִשְׁבַּתִּי לֹא־יִדְרֹךְ הֵידָד הֵידָד לֹא הֵידָד. *πρωΐ οὐκ ἐπάτησαν* (א* *ἐπάτησας*, A *ἐπατήθησαν*), *οὐδὲ δείλης οὐκ ἐποίησαν αἶδε.* Gi. suggests that *πρωΐ* has arisen from a gloss בַּכְּרָם, introduced here through the influence of the parallel, Is. xvi. 10 (בַּכְּרָמִים), and taken as = בַּבְּקָרִים, with the help of the subsequent corruption of *αἰδὰδ* to *δείλης*. It seems however much easier to suppose that השׁב׳ (which Gi. makes O′ to omit) was read by them הִשְׁכִּם. This done, they became hopelessly confused as to the remainder of the *v.* In M.T. we should probably amend (from Is. l.c.) 1° הֵידָד to הַדֹּרֵךְ. The last word in O′ is a corrupted transliteration.

34. עַד־יַהַץ. *αἱ πόλεις* (א* *πόλις*) *αὐτῶν* (עָרֵיהֶם).

עֶגְלַת שְׁלִשִׁיָּה. *καὶ ἀγγελίαν* (AQ -*λία*) *Σαλασειά* (א* om. *κ. ἀγγ. Σ.*). The *ἀγγ.* is probably a corruption of a transliteration, the word being originally taken, and rightly, as a proper name. 'שׁ on the other hand is the ordinal, "the third" Eglath, i.e. as having two neighbours of the same name.

36. קִיר־חֶרֶשׂ. *κειράδας* (א* *κιδάρ*, A *κειδάρεις*). See on *v.* 31.

יִתְרַת עָשָׂה אָבָדוּ. *ἃ περιεποιήσατο ἀπώλετο ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου*; the last two words being inserted as an attempt at interpretation.

37. ראשׁ. O′ add *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ*.

38. וּבִרְחֹבֹתֶיהָ כֻּלֹּו (ק') מִסְפֵּד. *καὶ ἐπὶ* (Q *ταῖς*) *πλατείαις αὐτῆς*. But MSS. 22, 33, 36, and others (without ast.), and so SH., add *ὅλαις κοπετός*. The latter word, if not also the former, seems therefore to have been early omitted by accident.

נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה. O′ *vacat*; but it has *φησὶν Κύριος* earlier (after *συνέτριψα*). This difference of position in the two texts illustrates the character of the insertion, as a frequent gloss.

39. אֵיךְ חַתָּה הֵילִילוּ. *πῶς κατήλλαξεν;* The least change possible is (on account of the masculines that follow) to read חַתּוּ, understanding Moab as the subject. So Gi. Possibly הֵילִילוּ is a gloss. There remains *κατηλ.* Cappellus (*Notae Crit.*

*ad loc.*, quoted by J. F. Schleusner) suggests that it is a corruption of *κατέαξεν*; Spohn *ad loc.* that O′ had 'Αγὰθ (see *v.* 1), *ὀλόλυξον*. Thus היל would be retained as part of the original text. In *v.* 1 however 'A. represents חַתָּה, not אֵיךְ ח׳.

40. הִנֵּה...מוֹאָב. O′ *vacat;* a gloss, supplied by xlix. 22 [xxix. 23], as is the latter part of *v.* 41.

41. וְהָיָה...מְצֵרָה. O′ *vacat.* See last note.

43. פַּחַד וָפַחַת וָפָח. *παγὶς καὶ φόβος καὶ βόθυνος*, transposing the order of the words. In the parallel passage, Is. xxiv. 17, the arrangement of the three substs. is as M.T. there and here, thus giving the order required for *v.* 44.

44. אֵלֶיהָ. *ταῦτα* (אֵלֶּה). Vulg. omits the word.

45, 46. O′ *vacat.* The verses are taken from Numb. xxi. 28, 29, xxiv. 17.

47. O′ *vacat;* doubtless a gloss. עַד ה׳ מ׳ מ׳, as Gi. points out, is a formula otherwise unknown, and apparently suggested to the glossator by *v.* 21.

xlix. [xxx.] 1. מַלְכָּם. Μελχόλ (Q Μολχόμ, and so SH.). It is evidently the proper name, and not "their king," and so in *v.* 3.

אֶת־גָּד. *τὴν* Γαλαὰδ (Q *τὸν* Γάδ); possibly rightly, and supported by Am. i. 13.

2. בְּנֵי־עַמּוֹן. O′ *vacat.* The passage, Am. i. 14, which resembles this, does not contain the words.

לְתֵל שְׁמָמָה. *εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς* (א om. *εἰς*) *ἀπώλειαν*. We must apparently take *ἄβ.* as a very free translation of תֵּל, for O′ understood it accurately enough in xxx. [xxxvii.] 18, עַל־תִּלָּהּ, *ἐπὶ τὸ ὕψος αὐτῆς*.

וּבְנֹתֶיהָ. *καὶ βωμοὶ* (אAQ pref. *οἱ*) *αὐτῆς*; reading וּבָמֹתֶיהָ; but M.T. seems to fit the context better.

אֶת־יֹרְשָׁיו. *τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ*; either reading אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ, or rendering freely, but giving up thereby any attempt at preserving the paronomasia.

3. עַי. O′ *vacat* (Q *Γαί*). Symm. *ἡ ἰσχὺς* (עָז); so MSS. 22, 36 (adding *Γαί*), and others, supported by two MSS. of Kenn. K. H. Graf would amend to עָר.

וְהִתְשׁוֹטַטְנָה בַּגְּדֵרוֹת. O′ *vacat* (Q *hab.*); MSS. 22, 36, and others have *καὶ διαδράμετε διὰ τῶν τριγχῶν* (*θριγχῶν*). But after *σάκκους* אQ have *καὶ ἐπιληµπτεύσασθαι* (A *κ. ἐπιληµπτεύεσθαι*), a verb which renders Hithp. of שׁגע in 1 Sam. xxi. 15. Aq. for בג׳ has *ἐν φραγμοῖς*.

מַלְכָּם. *Μελχόλ*. See on *v.* 1.

4. בָּעֲמָקִים זָב עִמְקֵךְ. *ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις Ἐνακεὶμ* (א* om. *Ἐν.*). O′ thus doubly represents the first word, omitting the others. These latter look also like a somewhat corrupted dittography of the previous letters. MS. 88 (and so SH.) *ἐν τ. π. Ζὴβ*

*πεδίοις σου*, 22, 36, and others Ἐν. *διέρρευσε τὰ πεδία σου*, Symm. *ἐν ταῖς κοιλάσι διέρρευσεν ἡ κοιλάς σου.*

הַשּׁוֹבֵבָה. (Q *τῆς*) *ἰταμίας*. See on xxxi. 22. זָדוֹן is rendered by *ἰτ.* in xlix. 16 [xxix. 17].

בְּאֹצְרֹתֶיהָ. O′ add *ἡ λέγουσα* for smoothness.

5. וְאֵין מְקַבֵּץ לַנֹּדֵד. *οὐκ* (ℵAQ pref. *καὶ*) *ἔστιν* (AQ *ἔσται*) *ὁ συνάγων*; thus omitting לַנֹּדֵד, which may easily be a later addition, as the same phrase is used without it in Is. xiii. 14; Nah. iii. 18.

6. O′ *vacat.* See on xlvi. 26.

7 [xxix. 8]. הַאֵין. O′ do not recognise the interrogation. The ה may be conjectured to have arisen from the last letter of יהוה immediately preceding, for, as O′ shew us, צְבָאוֹת, which now separates the two words, is an insertion in M.T.

מִבָּנִים. *ἐκ συνετῶν.* O′ read the word as we do, but made it the Ḳal ptcp. (not elsewhere found) of בּן. Otherwise we must suppose them to have read מִמְּבִנִים or מִנְּבֹנִים.

7, 8 [xxix. 8, 9]. נִסְרְחָה חָכְמָתָם׃ נָסוּ הָפְנוּ. *ᾤχετο σοφία αὐτῶν, ἠπατήθη ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν*, but ℵ* *ἠπ. τὸ πρὸς* (ℵ¹ *τόπος*) *αὐτόν*. Schwally, l. c. p. 201, considers *ἠπ.* (a corruption of *ἐπ.*) *ὁ τ. αὐ.* to represent a variant of נסר׳ חכ׳, viz. נִדְרְכָה מְכוֹנָתָם

(Gi. prefers נִרְמְסָה), while according to him נִסּוֹ הַפּ׳ is a gloss, and therefore unrepresented in O′. It is so far in favour of Schwally's view that it seems impossible to substitute for הפ׳ any word of similar appearance which shall at all answer to *τόπος*. א*'s rendering suggests לְפָנָיו. But surely O′ read נסו, and saw in it the root נשא, which is rendered by the same verb in iv. 10. For their willingness to assume the disappearance of the א, see on vii. 10, xliii. 2.

אֵיד עֵשָׂו. *δύσκολα ἐποίησεν* (עָשׂוּ, rendered, for the sake of the following words, as sing.). א׳ is translated *τροπή* in *v.* 32 [xxx. 10] and by *ἀπώλεια* in xviii. 17, xlvi. [xxvi.] 21.

9 [xxix. 10]. הִשְׁחִיתוּ דַיָּם. *ἐπιθήσουσιν χεῖρα* (אAQ *-ρας*) *αὐτῶν* (הֵשִׁיתוּ יָדָם). In the passage, Obad. 5, from which this is probably drawn (הֲלוֹא יִגְנְבוּ דַיָּם), O′ were more successful (*οὐκ ἂν ἔκλεψαν τὰ ἱκανὰ ἑαυτοῖς*;). That passage seems to have influenced the Vulg. here, "rapuissent quod sufficeret sibi." Comp. in Obad. "Nonne furati essent sufficientia sibi?"

10 [xxix. 11]. חָשַׂפְתִּי. *κατέσυρα* (A *κατηραύνησα*). As נֶחְפְּשׂוּ is the word in Obad. 6, we may (with Gi.) conjecture here חִפַּשְׂתִּי, as better suiting the idea of a hiding-place. O′ however seem to have read as we do, inasmuch as they

represent חשׂף (not, as Kircher, by *ἀνασύρειν* Is. xlvii. 2, but) by *περισύρειν* Gen. xxx. 38, while A's variant points in the same direction. (See Joel i. 7.)

וְנֶחְבָּה. *κρυβῆναι*; taking it as Niph. infin. abs. (נַחְבֹּה).

שֻׁדַּד זַרְעוֹ וְאֶחָיו וּשְׁכֵנָיו. *ὤλοντο διὰ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ* (א* *σου*; AQ *καὶ*) *γείτονός μου* (AQ *αὐτοῦ*); reading (with other obvious changes) בִּזְרֹעַ, and pointing to the overthrow as caused by a neighbour, Israel; so too Obad. 18—21.

10, 11 [xxix. 11, 12]. וְאֵינֶנּוּ: עָזְבָה. *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπολιπέσθαι.* M.T. is clearly right both in the stopping and in taking 'ע as an imperative.

11 [xxix. 12]. אֲנִי אֲחַיֶּה. *ἵνα ζήσεται· καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι* (Q om. *κ. ἐ. ζ.*); a duplicate rendering.

12 [xxix. 13]. שָׁתוֹ, 1° תִּנָּקֶה. O' *vacat.* Aq. Theod. *hab.*

כִּי שָׁתֹה תִּשְׁתֶּה. O' *vacat*, but AQ *ὅτι πιὼν πίεσαι*, and so (but with *πίνων*) MSS. 22, 33, and others; 36, 48, and others (and so SH.) *ὅτι πίνουσα πίῃ*.

13 [xxix. 14]. לְחֹרֶב. O' *vacat.*

בָּצְרָה. *ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς.* Probably 'בצ had fallen out of O''s Heb. text (*ἐν μ. αὐ.* being only a gloss). Hence they took תִּהְיֶה as the 2nd p. They had no difficulty in dealing with 'ב in 22 [xxix. 23], taking it however there as a common

noun. MSS. 22, 36, and others have Βοσὸρ ἐν μέσῳ μέρους αὐτῆς. 'ב is also supported by Aq. Symm. Theod.

16 [xxix. 17]. תִּפְלַצְתְּךָ. ἡ παιγνία σου; perhaps connecting the word with מִפְלֶצֶת, the idol mentioned in 1 K. xv. 13; 2 Chr. xv. 16. 'תפ, according to Gi., is a corruption of a gloss, הֲפִיצוֹתִיךָ.

הִשִּׁיא. ἐνεχείρησεν. See on xxxvii. 9.

שֹׁכְנִי. κατέλυσεν. שכן is similarly rendered xxv. 24 [xxxii. 10].

מְרוֹם גִּבְעָה. ἰσχὺν βουνοῦ ὑψηλοῦ; including doubtless a gloss.

17 [xxix. 18]. יִשֹּׁם...מַכּוֹתֶהָ. συριεῖ (Q ἐκστήσεται καὶ συρ. ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν πληγὴν αὐτῆς). The clause 'וישר...'מכ is a gloss from xix. 8.

18 [xxix. 19]. יְהוָה. Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ.

19—21 [xxix. 20—22]. This passage is to a large extent identical with l. [xxvii.] 44—46.

19 [xxix. 20]. מִגְּאוֹן. ἐκ μέσου (א* om. μ.). In xii. 5 ἐν φρυάγματι, while in l. [xxvii.] 44 ἀπὸ alone, expresses the word.

אֶל־נְוֵה. εἰς (A τὸν) τόπον. See on ix. 9 [10].

אֲרִיצֶנּוּ. ἐκδιώξω αὐτούς; as though reading, with M.T. ('ק) in l. [xxvii.] 44, אֲרִיצֵם.

וּמִי בָחוּר. καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους; a free render-

ing. So in l. [xxvii.] 44 we have *καὶ πάντα νεανίσκον.*

אֶפְקֹד. *ἐπιστήσατε* (A *-σεται*); perhaps an error arising from the sound of the following *ἀντιστήσεται.* In l. [xxvii.] 44 O′ have *ἐπιστήσω.*

יְעִדֶנִּי. *ἀντιστήσεταί μοι;* and so in l. [xxvii.] 44. So in Job ix. 19 יוֹעִידֵנִי is *ἀντιστήσεται*; Dan. xi. 2 עֹמְדִים (probably we should read מוֹעֲדִים), *ἀνθεστήκασιν* (Theod. *ἀναστήσονται*). Apparently in each case they connect with the root עוד, appearing, e.g. Ps. xx. 9 (וַנִּתְעוֹדָד).

20 [xxix. 21]. יִסְחָבוּם. *συνψηθῶσιν* (א *συνῶσιν*; AQ *συνψηφισθῶσιν*); as though reading יִסָּחֲבוּ. In the parallel passage (l. [xxvii.] 45) M.T. is as here, and O′ have again a passive (*διαφθαρῇ*).

נְוֵהֶם. *κατάλυσις αὐτῶν.* See on 19 [xxix. 20]. In l. [xxvii.] 45 the rendering is *νομή.*

21 [xxix. 22]. צְעָקָה בְּיַם־סוּף נִשְׁמַע קוֹלָהּ. *καὶ κραυγὴ θαλάσσης οὐκ ἠκούσθη*, but AQ *καὶ* (Q om. *καὶ*) *κρ. σου ἐν θαλάσσῃ οὐκ ἠκ.* MS. 88 *κραυγή σου ἐν θ. ἐρυθρᾷ ἐξηκούσθη ἡ. φωνὴ αὐτῆς*; so (but om. *ἡ* and with *σου* for *αὐτῆς*) 22, 36, and others. Σου would appear to be a corruption of Σούφ, while קו is probably an early gloss. For O′'s insertion of the negative see on xviii. 18.

22 [xxix. 23]. יַעֲלֶה וְ. O′ *vacat.*

יִדְאֶה. ὄψεται; reading ר for ד.

בָּצְרָה. ὀχυρώματα αὐτῆς. See on *v.* 13 [xxix. 14].

23 [xxx. 12]. בַּיָּם. O′ *vacat;* perhaps from perplexity as to the meaning. Schwally, l. c. p. 202, suggests that בַּיָּם may have been a gloss on נָמֹגוּ. Cor. (p. 57, where see his discussion of other conjectures) considers that the primitive reading in this part of the *v.* was נמגו בה מדאגה.

דְּאָגָה. ἐθυμώθησαν (א* ἠθ.). This seems an early error for ἠθυμήθησαν (דָּאֲגוּ); for elsewhere in this Book ד׳ is rendered by φοβεῖσθαι (xvii. 8), λόγον ἔχειν (xxxviii. [xlv.] 19, xlii. [xlix.] 16).

24 [xxx. 13]. צָרָה וח׳...כַּיּוֹלֵדָה. O′ *vacat.* Aq. Theod. represent the clause from וח׳ onwards. SH. also omits צָרָה וְ. This portion therefore is probably a gloss. The remainder is needed for the parallelism.

25 [xxx. 14]. עִיר תְּהִלָּה (תְּהִלַּת ק׳) קִרְיַת מְשׂוֹשִׂי. πόλιν ἐμήν; κώμην ἠγάπησαν. O′ had either a different or a defective text.

26 [xxx. 15]. יִדַּמּוּ. πεσοῦνται; reading יִרְמוּ, as is shewn by l. [xxvii.] 30, where ῥιφήσονται represents יד׳. See on viii. 14 for other instances.

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא. O' *vacat.*

27 [xxx. 16]. אַרְמְנוֹת. *ἄμφοδα.* See on vi. 5.

בֶּן־הֲדָד. *υἱοῦ Ἀδέρ.* So elsewhere (1 K. xv. 18, 20, xx. [xxi.] 1; 2 K. xiii. 3, 24; Am. i. 4). Wo. (p. 265) defends the form, both on the ground of its uniform occurrence in O', and on that of its being akin, or equivalent, to the title of an Assyrian deity appearing in the word Adrammelech (2 K. xvii. 31, xix. 37).

28 [xxx. 6]. וּלְמַמְלְכוֹת חָצוֹר. (AQ τῇ) *βασιλίσσῃ τῆς αὐλῆς* (לְמַלְכַּת חָצֵר).

וְשָׁדְדוּ. *καὶ πλήσατε*; but Q rightly *πλήξατε.*

30 [xxx. 8]. נֻדוּ. O' *vacat;* probably a gloss; for they do not fail to render it (though variously) elsewhere in this Book.

חָצוֹר. *ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ.* See on *v.* 28.

31 [xxx. 9]. וְלֹא־בְרִיחַ. *οὐ* (A *οὐδὲ*) *βάλανοι οὐ* (Q[a] *οὐδὲ*) *μοχλοί*; a double rendering.

32 [xxx. 10]. לְשָׁלָל. *εἰς ἀπώλειαν.* שׁ receives diverse renderings; in xxi. 9 *σκῦλα*, in xxxviii. [xlv.] 2, xxxix. [xlvi.] 18 *εὕρεμα.*

קְצוּצֵי פֵאָה. *κεκραμένους* (B[ab]אQ *κεκαρμένους*) *πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν.* The same Heb. in ix. 26 is rendered *περικειρόμενον τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ.* This of itself corrects the *κεκραμ.* פֵּאָה in both places was connected by O' with פֶּה.

33 [xxx. 11]. חָזוֹר. *ἡ αὐλή*. See on *v.* 28.

תַּנִּים. *στρουθῶν*. See on x. 22.

34. This *v.* is in the main equivalent to O''s xxvi. 1, which is however there the *end* of the Elam section.

35 [xxv. 15]. הִנְנִי שֹׁבֵר. Συνετρίβη (אAQ *συντριβήτω*); to avoid anthropomorphism. See on xxxi. 20.

36 [xxv. 16]. הַגּוֹי. *ἔθνος*. The ה arose by dittography, יִהְיֶה preceding.

37 [xxv. 17]. רָעָה. O' *vacat; κακὰ* (א *hab.*) having fallen out before *κατά*.

l. [xxvii.] 1. אֶל־אֶרֶץ...הַנָּבִיא. O' *vacat.*

2. וּשְׂאוּ־נֵס הַשְׁמִיעוּ. O' *vacat*; owing to the recurrence of 'הש.

בֵּל. O' add *ἡ ἀπτόητος, ἡ τρυφερά*.

חַת. *παρεδόθη*; possibly a corrupt form of *παρελύθη*. Comp. *v.* 36 וְחָתּוּ, *καὶ παραλυθήσονται*.

הֹבִישׁוּ...גִּלּוּלֶיהָ. O' *vacat.*

3. נָדוּ הָלָכוּ. O' *vacat.* The words are suggested by ix. 9.

5. בֹּאוּ וְנִלְווּ. *καὶ ἥξουσιν καὶ καταφεύξονται.* Probably neither text is right. Read, with Cor. (p. 76) 'ב' וְנִלְוָה. So Pesh. (ܢܬܠܘܘܢ ܘ). He compares li. 10, xxxv. 11.

7. נָאשֵׁם. *ἀνῶμεν αὐτοὺς* (reading נִשָּׂאֵם). Comp. Is. ii. 9.

נְוֵה־צֶדֶק. *νομὴ δικαιοσύνης.* See on ix. 9 [10].

וּמִקְוֵה. *τῷ συναγαγόντι* (מְקַוֵּה).

יְהוָה. O′ *vacat.*

8. כְּעַתּוּדִים. *ὥσπερ δράκοντες*; apparently a corruption of *τράγοι*, inasmuch as the word עַתּ׳ is shewn to be not unfamiliar to O′, by their rendering *ἔριφοι* in li. [xxviii.] 40.

9. וּמַעֲלֵה. O′ *vacat.*

גְּדֹלִים. O′ *vacat.*

11. כְּעֶגְלָה דָשָׁא (thus and not רשה. See Baer and Del. *Adnot. Crit.*). *ὡς βοΐδια ἐν βοτάνῃ* (דֶּשֶׁא). So Pesh. (ܕܥܣܒܐ) and Vulg. Yet this wrecks the Heb. grammar, which demands the ptcp. (*trampling*). Targ. (כְּעֶגְלֵי רִבְקָא) is right. Correct Gi.'s note accordingly, and see, for the use of רבקה in connexion with threshing, Levi, *Neuheb. u. Ch. Wörterb.* s. v.

כָּאַבִּירִים. *ὡς ταῦροι.* See on viii. 16.

12. חָפְרָה יוֹלַדְתְּכֶם. O′ *vacat* (A *ἐνετράπη ἡ τεκοῦσα ἡμᾶς*; Q with ast. *ἐν. ἡ τ. ὑμᾶς*). The words are also absent in MSS. 23, 26, 86, 106, and in SH. They appear (in Q's form) in Symm. and Theod. For *ἐν.* MSS. 22, 36, and others have

*κατωρύγη*. Comp. Symm. in Ps. lxx. [lxxi.] 24. See Field on both passages.

הִנֵּה. *μήτηρ ἐπ'* (Q *εἰς*) *ἀγαθά*. Gi. suggests Mic. i. 12 as the source of O′, which, as compared with M.T. *here*, appears incapable of explanation.

צִיָּה וַעֲרָבָה. O′ *vacat*.

14. כִּי...חָטָאָה. O′ *vacat*.

15. הָרִיעוּ עָלֶיהָ. *καὶ κατακρατήσατε* (AQ *ἐπ'*) *αὐτήν*. O′'s choice of verb is strange. Κ*ατακροτ*. has been suggested (comp. v. 31). It is otherwise unknown in O′, although Liddell and Scott give it without reservation as occurring there. Elsewhere in this Book *κατακρατεῖν* renders the Hiph. of חזק (*v.* 43, viii. 5), or Ḳal of תפש (xl. [xlvii.] 10).

אָשְׁיוֹתֶיהָ ק׳. *αἱ ἐπάλξεις αὐτῆς*. See on v. 10.

16. חֶרֶב הַיּוֹנָה. *μαχαίρας Ἑλληνικῆς*. See on xxv. 38.

17. עִצְּמוֹ. *τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ* (עֲצָמָיו).

18. אֶל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל. *ἐπὶ τὸν Βαβυλῶνος*; but $B^{ab\ marg.}$ אAQ insert *βασιλέα*.

19. וְהַבָּשָׁן. O′ *vacat*.

21. עַל־הָאָרֶץ מְרָתַיִם עֲלֵה עָלֶיהָ. (20) *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, λέγει Κύριος*. (21) *Πικρῶς ἐπίβηθι ἐπ' αὐτήν*. O′, not understanding מר׳, divided the sentences wrongly (finding also נְאֻם יְהוָה in their text). Although they read the last two words as

we do, Gi. proposes to substitute עֵילָם for עָלִיהָ, as in Is. xxi. 2, so as to supply a subject for the imperative.

וְאֶל־יוֹשְׁבֵי. καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπ' αὐτὴν (Q ἐν αὐτῇ; א* om. the whole; A om. ἐπ'). 'יושב may have been read, and taken to represent יוֹשְׁבֶיהָ.

פְּקוֹד. ἐκδίκησον; failing to recognise the proper name, which occurs also in Ezek. xxiii. 23, and there is treated as such by O'.

חֲרֹב וְהַחֲרֵם. μάχαιρα (חֶרֶב) καὶ ἀφάνισον. 'ח is very possibly a gloss (as Gi. suggests) on the following imperative. The transitive sense which it here bears can be paralleled only by *v.* 27.

אַחֲרֵיהֶם. O' *vacat.*

22. בָּאָרֶץ. O' *vacat.*

גָּדוֹל. O' add ἐν γῇ Χαλδαίων.

24. יְקַשְּׁתוּ. ἐπιβήσονται; but B^ab^אQ ἐπιθήσονται. The verb does not occur elsewhere in this Book. The corresponding substantive is correctly translated in v. 26.

בָּבֶל. ὡς (Q om. ὡς) Βαβυλών; doubtless a corruption of ὦ B., perhaps induced by the sound of γνώσῃ dwelling on the ear.

26. בֹּאוּ־לָהּ מִקֵּץ. ὅτι ἐληλύθασιν οἱ καιροὶ αὐτῆς. O' seem to have read as we do, or possibly

מִקְצָה, as in li. [xxviii.] 31. *Καιρὸς* is their rendering also in Gen. vi. 13; Lam. iv. 18 [19] (*bis*); Dan. viii. 17 (and ? ix. 26); 2 Chr. xxi. 19.

מַאֲבֻסֶיהָ. *τὰς ἀποθήκας αὐτῆς*; rightly, but Vulg. has *ut exeant qui conculcent eam*, as though the word were connected with בוס.

סָלּוּהָ כְמוֹ־עֲרֵמִים. *ἐραυνήσατε* (B$^{ab}$ℵ$^{?}$Q *ἐρευν.*; A pref. *καὶ*) *αὐτὴν ὡς σπήλαιον* (ℵ om. *ὡς σπήλ.*). O′ probably read סל׳ as we do. In Is. lvii. 14 they translate *καθαρίσατε*. ער׳ they seem to have read as מְעָרִים or מְעָרָה.

27. חִרְבוּ. *ἀναξηράνατε*. See on *v.* 21.

כָּל־פָּרֶיהָ. *αὐτῆς πάντας τοὺς καρποὺς* (Q *π. τ. κ. αὐ.*); reading פְּרִיָהּ.

28. נִקְמַת הֵיכָלוֹ. O′ *vacat*.

29. אֶל־קָדוֹשׁ. *θεὸν ἅγιον* (אֵל קד׳). See on li. 5.

30. יִדַּמּוּ. *ῥιφήσονται*. See on xlix. 26.

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא. O′ *vacat*.

31. פְּקַדְתִּיךָ. *ἐκδικήσεώς* (ℵA pref. *τῆς*) *σου* (Q* om. *σου*); reading פְּקֻדָּתְךָ.

32. בְּעָרֶיו. *ἐν τῷ δρυμῷ αὐτῆς*; reading בְּיַעְרוֹ. Comp. (where M.T. agrees with O′) xxi. 14.

34 אֶת־רִיבְכֶם. *πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιδίκους αὐτοῦ* (אֶת־רִיבָיו).

לְמַעַן הִרְגִּיעַ. *ὅπως ἐξάρῃ.* For the Heb. root see on iv. 20, and for *ἐξαίρειν* in an active sense, xviii. 7, where it renders the root נתשׁ.

36. חֶרֶב אֶל־הַבַּדִּים וְנֹאָלוּ. O′ *vacat.* See note on xlviii. 30. Wo. is going too far, when, in maintaining the absence of the clause from O′'s Heb. text, he says (p. 46) "they are all simple words and easy to translate." בַּדִּים is used but once elsewhere (Is. xliv. 25) of persons (comp. too O′'s difficulty in xlviii. [xxxi.] 30), while נאל' also is somewhat rare.

37. וְאֶל־כָּל־. O′ pref. *μάχαιραν ἐπὶ τοὺς μαχητὰς αὐτῶν*; an accidental repetition from the similar words of *v.* 36.

38. חֹרֶב. O′ *vacat.* חֶרֶב was read by SH., with which MSS. 22, 36, and others agree. It is hard to imagine that O′ would under the circumstances have omitted the word, had it stood in their Heb. text.

וְיָבֵשׁוּ. *καὶ καταισχυνθήσονται* (וְיֵבֹשׁוּ), which is supported by Ps. xcvii. 7. See next note.

וּבָאֵימִים יִתְהֹלָלוּ. *καὶ ἐν ταῖς νήσοις οὗ* (א *σου*; AQ om.) *κατεκαυχῶντο.* Gi. points out that Ps. xcvii. 7 serves to correct both these words. הַמִּתְהַלְלִים בָּאֱלִילִים there give us וּבָאֱלִילִים יִתְהֹלָלוּ here. O′ read בָּאִיִּים, thus testifying to

an early corruption. Kenn. has as variants ובה מים, ובאלים מים, ובאי מים. Symm. supports M.T. (*ἰσχυροί*), and Vulg. *portenta*. Aq. has *εἴδωλα*, Targ. וּבְטַעֲוָתָא, by which, as Gi. points out, אֵל is without exception rendered in the prophets.

39. צִיִּים. *ἰνδάλματα*. In Is. xiii. 21 we find *θηρία*, xxxiv. 14 *δαιμόνια*.

אֶת־אִיִּים. *ἐν ταῖς νήσοις*; taking the wrong sense. Is. xiii. 22, xxxiv. 14 have *ὀνοκένταυροι*.

בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה. *θυγατέρες σειρήνων*. So in Mic. i. 8.

לָנֶצַח. *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. See on iii. 5.

וְלֹא־תִשְׁכּוֹן...וְדֹר. O′ *vacat*.

41—43. This passage strongly resembles vi. 22—24.

42. וְכִידֹן. See on vi. 23.

יִרְכָּבוּ עָרוּךְ. *ἱππάσονται παρεσκευασμένοι* (B* *παρασκ.*; א *παρεσκ. ἱππ.*). Comp. the rendering in vi. 23.

כְּאִישׁ. *ὥσπερ πῦρ*. See on vi. 23.

44—46. See also notes on xlix. 19—21.

44. נָוֵה. O′ *vacat* (AQ *τόπον*).

li. [xxviii.] 1. לֵב קָמָי. *Χαλδαίους*; doubtless representing the original reading, subsequently altered by the figure of Atbash. Other instances are found in *v.* 41, xxv. 26 [xxxii. 12], where see

note. As Wo. says (p. 246), this species of cipher-writing may have been adopted during the time of the Babylonian captivity. There is no reason to suppose that it was known to the prophet, or even after his time employed outside Palestine.

רוּחַ. *ἄνεμον καύσωνα.*

2. זָרִים וְזֵרוּהָ. *ὑβριστάς, καὶ καθυβρίσουσιν* (A *-βριοῦσιν*; Q *-βρίσωσιν*) *αὐτήν*; reading ד for ר. M.T. however is so far right (comp. xlix. 36), but we should read זֹרִים, in order that both verbs may be from the same root.

כִּי־הָיוּ עָלֶיהָ. *οὐαὶ ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνα* (reading הוֹי).

3. (ק) אֶל־יִדְרֹךְ הַדֹּרֵךְ. *τεινέτω* (ℵ[c.a marg.] pref. *ἐπ' αὐτήν*; Q pref. *ἐπ' αὐτῇ*) *ὁ τείνων.* It seems tempting to read אַל, and so וְאַל later. We then omit 2° יִדְרֹךְ in accordance with ק׳. (For O''s omission of negative see on xviii. 18.) Doubtless there is some corruption in the text. The M.T. is harsh indeed in its construction (אֶל־יד׳ = אֵלָיו אֲשֶׁר יד׳), even when we connect with עָלֶיהָ of *v.* 2, but yet it has the advantage over the reading of the negative (with 2° ידרך retained), that it makes the same persons to be addressed throughout the sentence, and does not, like the other, require that the first part should refer to the besieged, the second to the besiegers.

יִתְעַל. περιθέσθω; reading apparently יִתְאַלֵּף. Wo. also suggests יַעְטֶה.

בִּסְרִינוֹ. ᾧ (א ὡς) ἐστὶν ὅπλα αὐτοῦ. Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 4, θώρακας. Cor. (p. 77) says that O''s rendering of this and the preceding word points to a reading וְיִתְעַל עָלָיו סִר', whence he conjectures as the original, בסר' (*the enemy*) וַיִּתְעַל הָעֹלָה.

5. מִקְּדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל. ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων Ἰσραήλ; as though the adjective (in defiance of grammar) were applied attributively to Israel. In l. [xxvii.] 29 the context (אֶל־יְהוָֹה) saved them from this particular error, and so in ii. 2 (where however see note). The frequency of the expression in Isaiah should of itself have guarded the translators sufficiently.

6. תְּרַמּוּ. ἀποριφῆτε. See on viii. 14.

7. 2° גּוֹיִם. O' *vacat*.

8. צֳרִי. ῥητίνην. See on viii. 21.

9. נִרְפָּתָה. See on iii. 22.

10. אֶת־צִדְקֹתֵינוּ. τὸ κρίμα αὐτοῦ; not implying any difference of text. In illustration of the thought that the rights of the holy nation (or individual) involve judgment upon the enemy comp. (so Gi.) the use of צֶדֶק in Is. lxii. 1; Ps. xvii. 1.

11. הַשְּׁלָטִים. *τὰς φαρέτρας.* So in Ezek. xxvii. 11. In 2 S. viii. 7 we find *χλιδῶνες* (*bracelets*), in 2 K. xi. 10 *οἱ τρισσοί* (*the triple things*), in Cant. iv. 4 *βολίδες* (*missiles*), in 2 Chr. xxiii. 9 *τὰ ὅπλα.* Thus the word was for the most part a puzzle to the translators. The probable meaning is none of these, but *shields.*

מַלְכֵי. *βασιλέως* (א* *-ων,* א? *-ως*). Comp. *v.* 28.

מְזִמָּתוֹ. *ἡ ὀργὴ αὐτοῦ.* Comp. *ἐγχείρημα* in xxiii. 20, xxx. [xxxvii.] 24.

הֵיכָלוֹ. *λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*; but MSS. 26, 36, 41, and others (and so SH.) have *ναοῦ αὐτοῦ.* The reading of the uncials seems to have been an early error.

12. נֵס. *σημεῖον*; and so in *v.* 27. See on the other hand the rendering in iv. 6, 21.

הַמִּשְׁמָר. *φαρέτρας* (א* *-τραν,* א? *-τρας*). The word seems, owing to the influence of *v.* 11, to have been accidentally substituted for *φύλακας*, a frequent rendering, found here in MSS. 22, 96, and others, (and so SH.).

הָאֹרְבִים. *ὅπλα.* See on xliii. 10.

13. אַמַּת בִּצְעֵךְ. *ἀληθῶς εἰς* (אA *ἐπὶ*) *τὰ σπλάγχνα σου*; (אֶמֶת בְּמֵעָיִךְ). Aq. *ἀλήθεια πλεονεξίας σου.* Symm. renders 'א by *πῆχυς.* Vulg. *pedalis præcisionis tuæ.* The expression in M.T. is however a strange one. Gi. proposes נִצְמַת בצ'. צמת occurs

in Niph. Job vi. 17, xxiii. 17, in the sense *to be extinguished.*

14. בְּנַפְשׁוֹ. *κατὰ τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ*; apparently an accidental substitution of an equally familiar formula.

כִּי אִם־מִלֵּאתִיךָ. *διότι Πληρώσω σε*; thus supporting the simple כִּי against כִּי אִם, which latter it is difficult to take in the sense of *surely.* Gi. suggests כִּי אֲמַלֵּא אֹתְךָ.

הֵידָד. *οἱ καταβαίνοντες* (הַיֹּרֵד or הירד'). But possibly *κ.* is a corruption of *καταπατοῦντες*. In Is. xvi. 9 הֵידָד is rendered by *καταπατήσω*.

15—19. This passage is almost identical with x. 12—16, where see notes.

17. נִבְעַר. *ἐματαιώθη*; but AQ (as in x. 14) *ἐμωράνθη*.

20. בְּךָ מַמְלָכוֹת. *ἐκ σοῦ* (Q *ἐν σοί*, and so MSS. 22, 23, 26, and others, and SH., this last with the other reading in marg.) *βασιλεῖς*. If the first מ were by accident taken into the previous word, this with the confusion of ב and מ (for this see xx. 17) would combine to produce מִמְּךָ, and would go a good way towards explaining *βασ*. The same mistranslation of מם' however recurs in *v.* 27 in Bא.

22. וְנִפַּצְתִּי בְךָ זָקֵן וָנָעַר. O′ *vacat.* The

translators also make the preceding and following clauses to change places.

23. וְצִמְדּוֹ. *καὶ τὸ γεώργιον αὐτοῦ.* Elsewhere in O′ γ. is not used in this sense. In Gen. xxvi. 14 it renders עֲבֻדָּה, in Prov. xxiv. 30 [45], xxxi. 16 [xxix. 34] שָׂדֶה, while צֶמֶד appears elsewhere as *δύο* (*βόας*, 1 S. xi. 7), *κόχλαξιν* (1 S. xiv. 14), *ζεύγη* (*βοῶν*, Is. v. 10).

25. 1° הַמַּשְׁחִית. *τὸ διεφθαρμένον*; probably taking the word as a subst. (? מַשְׁחִית = מַשְׁחֵת of Ezek. ix. 1).

מִן־הַסְּלָעִים. *ἐπὶ* (but ℵAQ *ἀπὸ*) *τῶν πετρῶν.*

27. מַמְלְכוֹת אֲרָרַט. *βασιλεῖς ἄρατε*; but AQ *βασιλείαις* Ἀραρὲθ (Q -*ρέτ*). MS. 88 *βασιλείας* Ἀραρέθ, and so SH. (with -*ράθ*). Ἄρατε is doubtless a corruption.

מִנִּי. *παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ*; a similar mistake to that of Ps. xlv. [xliv.] 9, where מִנִּי, *stringed instruments*, appears as *ἐξ ὧν.*

טִפְסָר. *βελοστάσεις.* The word is used to render כַּר, *a battering-ram*, in Ezek. iv. 2, and דָּיֵק, *a watch-tower*, in Ezek. xvii. 17, xxi. 27 [22]. In Nah. iii. 17 (its only other occurrence) וְטַפְסְרַיִךְ appears as *ὁ συμμικτός σου.* O′ was thus unacquainted with the word.

כְּיֶלֶק סָמָר. *ὡς ἀκρίδων πλῆθος.* סָמָר occurs

here only, and the verbal root is found but twice (Ps. cxix. [cxviii.] 120, *καθήλωσον*; Job iv. 15, *ἔφριξαν*). Hence O′'s failure to interpret rightly. See Field's note for discussion of the word.

28. קַדְּשׁוּ. *ἀναβιβάσατε*; corrupted from *ἁγιάσατε* (read by MSS. 22, 36, and others, and by SH.), and arising from the *ἀναβ.* of the previous clause. But see on xxii. 7.

מַלְכֵי. *τὸν βασιλέα.*

מָדַי. *τῶν Μήδων καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς.* It is clear that O′ cannot have had these words, when rendering מַלְ by a sing. They are therefore a gloss, probably suggested through the absence from their text of the gloss which now ends the *v.* in M.T. See next note.

וְאֵת כָּל־אֶרֶץ מֶמְשַׁלְתּוֹ. O′ *vacat* (A *καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς ἐξουσίας αὐτοῦ*); clearly a gloss. The masc. pron. has no antecedent. Wo.'s comments on this *v.* (pp. 83 f., 143) are by no means convincing.

30. נָשְׁתָה. *ἐθραύσθη*; loosely. The verb occurs but three times in M.T. O′ were more successful in Is. xli. 17 (Ḳal), *ἐξηράνθη*, but see Is. xix. 5, *πίονται*.

הִצִּיתוּ. *ἐνεπυρίσθη*; reading הֻצְּתוּ. The Hoph. does not, it is true, occur elsewhere, but on account of the parallelism is probably right here.

31, 32. מִקָּצֶה : וְהַמַּעְבָּרוֹת. (32) *ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν διαβάσεων αὐτοῦ.*

32. וְאֶת־הָאֲגַמִּים. *καὶ τὰ συστέματα* (B$^{a?b}$Q *-στημ-*) *αὐτῶν* (AQ *αὐτοῦ*). It is strange that O′ should have rendered the word rightly (*ἕλη*), not only in its two occurrences in the Pentateuch (which would naturally from the subject-matter be specially familiar to Jews dwelling in Egypt, viz. Exod. vii. 19, viii. 1 [5]), but also in Is. xxxv. 7, xlii. 15. In the only other occurrence of the word (Ps. cvii. [cvi.] 35) it appears as *λιμένας* or *λίμνας*.

נִבְהָלוּ. *ἐξέρχονται*; loosely. The verb does not occur elsewhere in this Book. For O″s treatment of בֶּהָלָה see on viii. 15 and xv. 8.

33. בַּת־בָּבֶל. *Οἶκοι* (Q *-κος*) *βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος*; reading בָּתֵּי. *Βασ.* seems a gloss, suggested by such passages as xxxiii. [xl.] 4, (xliii. [l.] 12, 13).

34. אֲכָלַנִי (ק׳) הֲמָמַנִי (ק׳) נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מ׳ ב׳ הִצִּיגַנִי (ק׳) כְּלִי רִיק. *κατέφαγέν με, ἐμερίσατό με, κατέλαβέν με σκότος λεπτόν,* Ναβουχοδ. *β.* B. The verb הַמ׳ occurs here only in this Book. Elsewhere O′ renders it mostly by *ἐκταράσσω* or *ἐξίστημι.* Gi. (p. xxii) proposes הִדְמִין. The variety in position of נ׳ מ׳ ב׳ suggests that the words are a gloss in both texts. *σκότος λεπτὸν* seems a corruption for *σκεῦος κενόν.* MSS. 22, 36, and others

give both these as a conflate rendering, *κατέλαβέ με ὡς σκότος λ.... κατέστησέ με ὡς σκεῦος κ.* SH. also gives *κατέλαβεν* (before *ἐμερ.*), apparently as a corruption of *κατέφαγεν.*

34, 35. הֱרִיחָנִי (ק׳) חֲמָסִי וּשְׁאֵרִי. (35) *ἐξῶσάν με οἱ μόχθοι* (א *ἐχθροὶ*) *μου καὶ αἱ ταλαιπωρίαι μου*; reading חֲמָסַי וְשֹׁדִי. Gi.'s conjecture (p. xxi) ושברי (for ושארי) is barred by O''s usage elsewhere. See on iv. 13, 20.

37. לְגַלִּים...תַּנִּים. O' *vacat.* The remaining words at any rate were in all probability absent from their Heb. text. For לג׳ see on ix. 10 [11].

וּשְׁרֵקָה. O' *vacat.*

38. יִשְׁאֲגוּ נָעֲרוּ. *ἐξηγέρθησαν.* MS. 88 (supported by SH.) adds *οἱ παῖδες αὐτῶν* (נְעָרָיו). So 22, 36, and others, *οἱ νεανίσκοι αὐτῶν.* The root נ׳ in this sense is not found elsewhere in M.T., and hence may have been omitted by O' as unintelligible. שׁ׳ is rightly rendered in ii. 15 (*ὠρύοντο*) and loosely in xxv. 30 [xxxii. 16] (*χρηματιεῖ bis*). In Hos. xi. 10; Am. iii. 4, 8 it is translated *ἐρεύξεται.* It is thus *possible* that the present Greek text may be corrupted from *ἐρεύξονται.* So Aq. Theod. render here in the second clause.

39. יַעֲלֹזוּ. *καρωθῶσιν* (א* *καθαρῶσιν*); a word not found elsewhere in O'. Gi. suggests that they read יַעֲלְפוּ.

40. אוֹרִידֵם. *καὶ* (AQ om. *καὶ*) *καταβίβασον* (א* -*σω*) *αὐτούς* (וְהוֹרִידֵם).

41. שֵׁשַׁךְ. O' *vacat*. See on *v*. 1.

43. 2° אֶרֶץ. O' *vacat*.

44. עַל־בֵּל בְּבָבֶל. *ἐπὶ* Βαβυλῶνα. The shorter reading is probably right. Gi. points out that בל ב might, it is true, easily fall out before בבל. Yet inasmuch as (*a*) it was not Bel but Babylon (*v*. 34) which had been the devourer, and (*b*) the parallelism of the clause וְלֹא...גוֹיִם with the language used in Is. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1 in reference to *Jerusalem*, indicates a city or nation here also, he thinks it best to consider M.T. to contain a gloss, perhaps facilitated by the letters of בלעו.

44—49. גַּם־חוֹמַת...יִשְׂרָאֵל. O' *vacat*. The cause of the omission was the similarity between גם חומת בבל נפלה and גם לבבל נפלו.

50. מֵחֶרֶב. *ἐκ γῆς*. We can only conjecture that the word was obscurely written, and that under these circumstances the influence of the following word הָלְכוּ determined the rendering.

52. יֶאֱנֹק. *πεσοῦνται*. The verb and corresponding subst. have been successfully dealt with by O' in their other occurrences. Here probably

obscurity of writing was the cause of the mistranslation.

53. תִּבַצֵּר מְרוֹם עֻזָּהּ. *ὀχυρώσῃ* (Q *ὑψώσῃ*) *τὰ τείχη* (B[ab] *τὰ ὕψη*, א* *ὕψη*, א[c.a] AQ *ὕψος*) *ἰσχύι* (א[c.a] AQ *-χύος*) *αὐτῆς*; apparently reading for 'מ by an early error חֹמוֹת. Comp. (i. 18;) xv. 20; Deut. xxviii. 52; Is. ii. 15, xxii. 10 for the connexion of 'בצ and 'ח.

55. וְהָמוּ גַלֵּיהֶם. *ἠχοῦσαν*. 'ג may easily be a gloss, introduced under the influence of v. 22, xxxi. 34, where 'ה and 'ג are connected.

56. עָלֶיהָ עַל־בָּבֶל. *ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνα*. 'על ב was probably a gloss upon על, and found by O′ already incorporated in the text. They thus omitted the wrong word.

שׁוֹדֵד. *ταλαιπωρία*. See on iv. 13.

חִתְּתָה. *ἐπτόηται*.

קַשְּׁתֹתָם. *τὸ τόξον αὐτῶν* (קַשְּׁתָם). We may note that this is the form (ש with and ת without Dagesh) adopted by Baer and Del. here as well as in Ps. xxxvii. 15 and Is. v. 28. See their *Adnot. Crit.* on the last-named *v.*

כִּי אֵל גְּמֻלוֹת. *ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀνταποδίδωσιν αὐτοῖς* (א* om. *αὐτ.*); reading גִּמֵּל אוֹתָם.

'יְהוָֹה שׁ' יש. (57) *Κύριος ἀνταποδίδωσιν* (א*

om. Κύρ. ἀντ., ℵ^c.a *hab.;* Q^a pref. αὐτός; AQ add αὐτῇ τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν). O′'s apparent omission of שַׁלֵּם by no means implies necessarily that they had not the present M.T. See on xxiii. 39.

57. וְהִשְׁכַּרְתִּי. καὶ μεθύσει μέθῃ (see on iii. 1). The change to the 3rd p. was consequential on the wrong division of the verses, as it involved the close connexion of this verb with the preceding one.

פַּחוֹתֶיהָ. O′ *vacat.*

וְגִבּוֹרֶיהָ. O′ *vacat.*

וְיָשְׁנוּ...יָקִיצוּ. O′ *vacat.* The clause is borrowed from *v.* 39.

58. חוֹמַת. τεῖχος; thus agreeing with M.T. of *v.* 44.

הָרְחָבָה. ἐπλατύνθη (הִרְחֲבָה).

וְיָגְעוּ. καὶ οὐ κοπιάσουσιν. For the insertion of a negative see on xviii. 18.

עַמִּים בְּדֵי־רִיק וּלְאֻמִּים בְּדֵי־אֵשׁ. λαοὶ εἰς κενόν, καὶ ἔθνη ἐν ἀρχῇ (בְּרֹאשׁ). In the similar passage, Hab. ii. 13, O′ were slightly more successful with the somewhat infrequent בְּדֵי (λαοὶ ἱκανοὶ...ἔθνη πολλά). Perles' conjectural emendation (l.c. p. 50) of אשׁ to יאשׁ (comp. this root in Niph. in ii. 25, xviii. 12) is a good one. The י may easily have fallen out through the בדי preceding, while we shall moreover gain a parallelism with ריק.

59. אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא אֶת־שְׂרָיָה. *ὃν ἐνετείλατο* Κύριος Ἰερεμίᾳ *τῷ προφήτῃ εἰπεῖν τῷ* Σαραίᾳ; altering in order to agree more nearly with the language of such passages as xxvi. [xxxiii.] 8.

אֶת־צִדְקִיָּהוּ. *παρὰ Σεδεκίου.*

שַׂר־מְנוּחָה. *ἄρχων δώρων* (מִנְחָה). So Targ. (רַב תּוּקְרָבְתָּא). Vulg. *princeps prophetiae* is obscure. נְבוּאָה seems too daring a conjecture. Doubtless as to the sense of 'מ Symm. is in the right, (*Σαραίας δὲ ἦν*) *ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναπαύσεως* (thus SH. corrects MSS. 86, 88, which represent Symm. as *ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναβάσεως*), (*prince of*) *the camping-place, quarter-master-general.*

60. אֶחָד. O′ *vacat;* אAQ add *ἐνί.*

62. יְהוָֹה. Κύριε Κύριε (אQ om. K. 2°).

64. הָרָעָה. *τῶν Χαλδαίων* (אAQ* *τῶν κακῶν*, Q* *κακῶν*); an early gloss, substituted for the text.

וְיָעֵפוּ עַד...יִרְמְיָהוּ. O′ *vacat.* 'וי clearly has to do with 'וי which ends *v.* 58. As Gi. suggests, 'עַד...ירמ may have originally stood there, and if so, on the removal of those words to their present place, 'וי may either intentionally or by accident (Cheyne, *Introd. to chaps. l. li.*, says the latter) have been transferred with it. The sense will be "To 'they shall be weary,' thus far are etc."

lii. 2, 3. O′ *vacat.*

4. הָעֲשִׂירִי. *τῷ ἐνάτῳ* (A *ἑβδόμῳ*; Q *δεκάτῳ*). 'Εν. seems to have come in here through the mistake in xxxix. [xlvi.] 1, where see note. While both A and Q have there the right reading, A is here unsuccessful in its emendation.

דָּיֵק. *τετραπόδοις* (Q adds *λίθοις*). In 2 K. xxv. 1 'ד is translated by *περίτειχος*.

6. בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָרְבִיעִי בְּתִשְׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ. *ἐν τῇ* (AQ* om. *ἐν τῇ*) *ἐνάτῃ τοῦ μηνός* (Q pref. with ast. *ἐν μηνὶ τῷ τετάρτῳ*). O′'s rendering is accidentally defective, xxxix. 2 supplying the words which are here lacking.

7. יִבְרְחוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ מֵהָעִיר. *ἐξῆλθον*; rightly, thus keeping closer to the Greek of Kings (*v.* 4).

בֵּין־הַחֹמֹתַיִם. *ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ τείχους* (A *τῆς πύλης*) *καὶ τοῦ προτειχίσματος*; explanatory.

8. אֶת־צִדְקִיָּהוּ. *αὐτόν.*

9. רִבְלָתָה. *εἰς Δεβλάθα.* 'באר' ח are absent also from Kings (*v.* 6).

11. הַפְּקֻדּוֹת. *μύλωνος.* So in xxxix. [xlvi.] 7 Q[marg.] inserts (after *Βαβυλῶνα*) *καὶ δοῦναι αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον τοῦ μύλ.*; a trace of tradition.

12. הִיא...בָּבֶל. O′ *vacat;* an insertion perhaps suggested (so Gi.) by 2 K. xxiv. 12.

עָמַד לִפְנֵי. *ἑστηκὼς κατὰ πρόσωπον*; thus

reading עֹמֵד. Both however should probably be emended (so Gi.) to (מֶלֶךְ) עֶבֶד, as in Kings (*v.* 8). For confusion of ב׳ and מ׳ see on xx. 17.

13. יְרוּשָׁלַםִ. τῆς πόλεως. M.T. is borrowed from Kings (*v.* 9).

14. וְאֶת־כָּל־חוֹמֹת. καὶ πᾶν τεῖχος. In Kings the corresponding verse (*v.* 10) is lacking.

17. נְחֻשְׁתָּם. O′ add καὶ ἀπήνεγκαν (QΓ om.). Kings (*v.* 13) has וַיִּשְׂאוּ.

18. וְאֶת־הַסִּרוֹת. καὶ τὴν στεφάνην. So also Exod. xxvii. 3, apparently taking the word as equivalent in sense to זֵר, which they render in the same way in Exod. xxv. 24, 25 [23, 24]. O′'s ordinary rendering of סִיר is λέβης, e.g. i. 13. So apparently Aq. Symm. here.

וְאֶת־הַיָּעִים. καὶ τὰς φιάλας. In Kings (*v.* 14) O′ transliterate (loosely) the word. Φ. however appears with them as its rendering in Numb. iv. 14. O′ here add καὶ τὰς κρεάγρας. This word generally renders מִזְלָג or מַזְלֵג. Once (2 Chr. iv. 11) it represents סִיר. It may therefore (as an alternative rendering to στεφάνην) do the same duty here. In that case מְזַמְּרוֹת will be unrepresented.

וְאֶת־הַמִּזְרָקֹת. O′ *vacat.* This word is ordinarily rendered by φιάλη. In Kings however (*v.* 14) it is lacking, and so may well be a gloss here and genuine in *v.* 19.

וְאֶת־הַכַּפּוֹת. O′ *vacat.* The word occurs in the next *v.*

The above account of these words seems preferable to that adopted by Gi. According to him the first two substantives in M.T. are those which are not represented in O′.

לָקָחוּ. O′ *vacat.*

19. וְאֶת־הַסִּפִּים וְאֶת־הַמַּחְתּוֹת וְאֶת־הַמִּזְרָקוֹת. καὶ τὰ (א τὰς) σαφφὼθ καὶ τὰ (א*AQ* τὰς) μασμαρὼθ (Q* τὰς μασμαὼθ); thus pointing to a considerable corruption of text, and to the omission of וְאֶת־הַמַּח׳.

וְאֶת־הַסִּירוֹת. O′ *vacat.* The words καὶ τοὺς ὑποχυτῆρας, which stand in this place, seem to be a second rendering of וְאֶת־הַמִּז׳. It is in itself unlikely that הַסִּ׳ would occur in both *vv.*, and if it did, O′ would scarcely render it differently in the two.

וְאֶת־הַכַּפּוֹת. καὶ τὰς θυίσκας. So in Kings (*v.* 14); Numb. vii. 14 etc.

20. הַמְּכֹנוֹת. τῆς θαλάσσης. In Kings also (*v.* 16) the subst. troubled O′, who there trans-

literate (*μεχωνώθ*). In the Temple as built by Solomon the 'מכ ("bases") were under the lavers, while the bulls supported the "sea" (1 K. vii. 25, 43). Hence O′'s substitution of *θαλ.* here. As however there is no mention of the bulls in the parallel place in Kings (*v.* 16), they may be an early interpolation in the M.T. here.

כָּל־הַכֵּלִים הָאֵלֶּה. O′ *vacat.* The words occur in Kings (*v.* 16) in M.T. and O′.

21. שְׁמֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה אַמָּה. *τριάκοντα πέντε πηχῶν.* Both texts of Kings (*v.* 17) agree with M.T. here as regards the number, which also corresponds with that given in 1 K. vii. 15 [3]. It is hard to account for the error, even on the assumption that numbers were at any period of the history of the text represented by letters (יח and לה).

נָבוֹב. *κύκλῳ* (Γ om.); reading סָבִיב, which occurs in *vv.* 22, 23. For O′'s tendency to adopt this mode for getting out of a difficulty see on xx. 11.

22. *τὸ μῆκος*; an explanatory insertion.

2° וְרִמּוֹנִים. *ὀκτὼ ῥόαι τῷ πήχει τοῖς δώδεκα πήχεσιν*; probably a gloss in both texts. That in O′ apparently rests upon the statement in *v.* 23 that the total number of pomegranates was one hundred. This, allowing one for each corner, would leave eight for each of the "twelve cubits," specified in *v.* 21.

23. רוּחָה. *ἓν μέρος* (B[ab]AQ pref. *τό*); a free and indeed inaccurate rendering of the Heb., which, as it stands, must mean *on all (four) sides*, i.e. *towards each wind*, but is in all probability corrupt.

24. אֶת־שְׂרָיָה and אֶת־צְפַנְיָה. O′ *vacat* (Q *Σαραίαν* and *Σοφονίαν*).

25. וּמִן־הָעִיר לָקַח סָרִיס. *καὶ* (AQ ins. *ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔλαβεν*) *εὐνοῦχον*.

שַׂר. O′ *vacat;* apparently erroneously. The word stands in both texts in Kings (*v.* 19).

26. רִבְלָתָה. *εἰς Δεβλάθα.* So in Kings (*v.* 20), but there in *v.* 21 we have ʽΡεβ. (A Δεβ.).

27. וַיְמִתֵם. O′ *vacat;* probably a gloss. If so, it was inserted in the Heb. of Kings (*v.* 21) early enough to be represented in O′.

וַיִּגֶל...אַדְמָתוֹ. O′ *vacat.* The same remark applies here.

28—30. O′ *vacat.* M.T. is an insertion from some other source, as appears from the discrepancy in the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as well as in the numbers of the captives, when compared with the accounts in 2 K. xxiv. 12, 14, xxv. 8.

31. בְּעֶשְׂרִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה. *ἐν τῇ τετράδι καὶ εἰκάδι.* In Kings (*v.* 27) the number is twenty-seven in both texts. Probably there was a difference in this detail of the tradition.

וַיֵּצֵא אֹתוֹ. *καὶ ἔκειρεν αὐτόν* (אAQ om. *κ. ἐκ. αὐτ.*), *καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτόν.* As Gi. points out, the first Greek verb seems to represent a corruption of וַיְשַׁלְּחֵהוּ (reading ג for the ש), and so far to represent a (probable) gloss.

34. אֲרֻחַת. O′ *vacat;* perhaps considering the word superfluous or an accidental repetition.

כֹּל יְמֵי חַיָּיו. O′ *vacat.*

# APPENDIX

## ON THE OLD LATIN EVIDENCE, WITH NOTES ON THE LUCIANIC RECENSION OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

In the following notes a colon divides each reading from that which succeeds it; spaced letters are used to call attention to a rendering which differs in sense from both M.T. ('כ) and B (even where such rendering does not necessarily imply a variant); small capitals call attention to an agreement with M.T. ('כ) against B. In all but the above-mentioned cases simple italics are used for the Latin. The reading of the Vulg. (Cod. Amiat.) heads each note and is preceded by an asterisk. When *part* of a reading appears within ( ), that part is only introduced in order to furnish a more ready clue to the state of the evidence, and not as implying a variant. Otherwise ( ) indicate that the testimony thus given is attended by circumstances (e.g. of possible or certain spuriousness) which weaken its force. In readings marked [ ] the quotation is apparently not meant as a formal one[1].

[1] In the case of Sang [ ] indicate a lacuna in the MS.

Evidence in the form of Biblical MSS. for the O. L. text of this prophet is but scanty. It consists of (*a*) the Würzburg fragments (W in the following notes), a portion of which was brought to light by Münter[1] and the whole more recently edited in a facsimile form by Ranke[2], who (praef. p. ix) places them "medio circiter saeculo"; (*b*) the St Gallen palimpsest (Sang), a fragment, of which an inaccurate version appeared in the 2nd ed. of Tischendorf's *Monumenta sacra et profana*, but which has just been freshly transcribed by F. C. Burkitt, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge[3].

The early patristic references, although sometimes failing us for a considerable space, yet occasionally are fairly numerous. In these the numbers in thicker type denote the Book, Sermon etc. referred to, any following figures the chapter or section or both, as the case may be. "Hier," when not followed by a specific reference, denotes St Jerome's rendering of the passage in his Comm. on Jeremiah, while "tr hom or" means his translation of the Homilies of Origen upon this Book, the number following in ( ) here and in some other citations of St Jer. being that of the Benedictine page. Reference to a passage of

[1] *Miscellanea Hafniensia Theologici et Philologici Argumenti*, ed. Münter, Tom. ii, Hafniae, 1824, pp. 112—122.

[2] *Par Palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium, Antiquissimae V. T. versionis Latinae fragmenta*, ed. Ernestus Ranke, Vienna, 1871. The fragments are as follows: xii 12—xiii 12; xiv 15—xv 11; xv 13—17; xvi 14—19; xvi 21—xvii 6; xvii 8—10; xviii 16—xx 4; xx 6—xxiii 39; xxxv 15—19; xxxvi 2—11; xxxvi 28—xxxvii 11; xxxviii 23—xl 5; xli 1—17.

[3] It contains xvii 10b—17 (somewhat mutilated); xlix [xxix] 13b—17. Mr Burkitt has kindly permitted me to use his transcription for these notes.

the Bible is made by Arabic figures, e.g. Ps 2 12 = Ps ii 12 (but Ps 2 § 39, Ps ii section 39). In such cases the second number indicates the last verse mentioned in the edition used, not necessarily that on which the patristic authority is at the moment commenting. In Priscillian the number refers to the page of Schepss[1], in Tycon. to Mr Burkitt's edition[2].

The references to Philo are those of Dr Ryle's ed.[3], in which "the sections are taken from the Tauchnitz edition, but the column and page of Mangey's edition are always added" (Ryle, p. xlvi).

Here and there in the following notes I have added the Benedictine pagination ("Bened. pag.") where it seemed advisable.

In citing patristic authorities I have included some, e.g. Cassiodorus (ob. c. 570), who flourished considerably later than St Jerome's time. They serve in some measure to illustrate the *gradual* acceptance of the Vulgate, and the mixed character of Latin texts.

In chapters i—v I have added in the form of footnotes readings supplied by MSS. (as given by Holmes and Parsons) which have been held to represent Lucian's recension. Of the 12 MSS. available for the purpose in these chapters (22, 23, 36, 48, 51, 62, 82, 90, 108, 144, 231, 233) six (22, 36, 48, 51, 82 and 108) have stronger testimony from experts than the rest as to their claim to a Lucianic character. I have kept the two classes distinct; thus Luc 4 + 2 (+ 1) means that the reading is

[1] *Priscilliani quae supersunt*, etc. 8vo. Vienna, 1889.

[2] *Texts and Studies* III. 1. *The Rules of Tyconius*, 8vo. Cambridge, 1894.

[3] *Philo and Holy Scripture*, 8vo. London, 1895.

supported by four of the more strongly attested and two of the less strongly attested, together with another of the latter class, whose evidence is in some way weakened.

For particulars as to the editions here used, as well as for general results of the subjoined examination of O. L. and of Lucianic evidence see the latter part of this Appendix.

i. 2. *DOMINI Hier[1].

i. 3. *USQUE AD CONSUMMATIONEM Hier[2].

i. 4. *AD ME DICENS[3] Hier.

i. 5. *DE VULVA Hier Ir [c haer 3 15 3] Tert [an 26] Cypr [test 1 21 de lap 10] Vict Pett [Apoc 11 5] Hil [Ps 119 5] Hier [tr hom or i (746) 2/2 xi (843)] (but *de v.* matris tuae [ib i (752)]) id [am 4 13] Ambr [exp Luc 1 15 (ib 25 *in v.*) de fide 1 2, 4 112] Aug [ep 32 187 op imp con Iul 4 134] Auc qu. ex vet test ap Aug [44] Pros Aqu [de voc 2 11] Leo Mag [ser 30] Mar Merc [hypog 3 26 2/2] : *in* UTERO [Hil [trin 6 20]] Aug [retract 1 26 de div qu 68 6 (comp de pec mer 1 30)] : *in* VULVA Faust et Marc [trin 2 4] Hier [Is 6 6 (Gal 1 15 ep 1 4)] Pet Chrys [ser 143] : *de v.* m. Ambr [de ben pat 51 de int Iob et D 2 21].

*et (*prophetam*) Auc quaest ex vet test ap Aug [44]: om *et* Hier.

i. 6. *A A A : AH AH AH Hier : *qui es* Hil [de trin 4 8] Hier [is 3 4]: quis es? Ambr [Ps 118 ב 26], but comp [Ps ib צ 34], where we find (without an interrogation) *iuvenis* (*bis*) for *puer* and *per* for *secundum*. See also tr hom or i (747, 753). *Qui es* is doubtless a genuine O. L. reading. In Jer iv 10 (see Hier's *Comm. ad loc.*) O. L. had *O*. O. L.

[1] Luc o + 1. [2] Luc 4 + 3.

[3] Luc 1 + 1 : πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγων Luc 3 + 2.

elsewhere has *qui est* (Ex iii 14 *bis*; so Hil etc.) or *O* (2 K vi 5 Hil) or *Oo* (Ezek xxx 2 Hier) or is lacking (2 K iii 10, vi 5). The reading ὁ ὤν of this and three other passages in this Book (see critical notes) is probably an early corruption, and, as representing the Ineffable Name, it suggested as one of its Latin renderings an interrogation which should refer to the uncomprehended nature of God.

i. 9. *OM (after *manum suam*) *ad me* Hier[1]: *hab* id tr hom or i (747, 754, 755) Cassiod[Ps 50 12].

i. 10. **et* SUPER (before *regna*) Hier: om *super* Ambr[Ps 43 3] Hier[Soph 1 13 tr hom or i (747, 755 *bis etc*)] Vigil Taps c varim 3 71 Fac Herm[pro def tr cap 8 5] Cassiod[ib.][2]

**ut evellas et destruas et disperdas* ET DISSIPES Hier Aug[de doct chr 3 17] Joh Cass[coll (xiv) de spir sci 3 2] Eugip[exc Aug 267]: *eradicare suffodere evertere* DISPERDERE Aug[Ps 50 8]: [*ad destructionem et aedificationem*] id[Ps 88 3]: *erad et disp* Hier tr hom or i (747): *e. et suff.*[ib]: *erad*[ib 755 2/2], and *erad et subvertere et disp*[ib xi (756, 844)], *erad et suff et disp*[ib i (758) Ezek 1 1 ff Soph 1 13], *ut ante eradicaret et suffoderet et perderet* Hier Eccles 3 (408) (but ? a loose quotation of xviii 7, 9): *ut evellas et destruas* Vigil Taps[ib]: *eradicare et effod et disp* Fac Herm[ib]: *eradicare et demolire et perdere* ET EXTERMINARE Cassiod[ib]: [*ut aedifices et destruas*] id[Ps 88 2].

i. 11. *IEREMIA Hier id[Eccles 12 (491)].[3]

*EGO VIDEO Hier[4]: om id[Eccles ib].

i. 12. *VERBO MEO: VERBUM MEUM Hier id[Eccles ib].

i. 13. **ollam succensam...a facie Aquilonis* Hier Eucher[form spir int 8]: *olla succensa* ab *Aquilone* Aug[Ps 59 10].

*EGO VIDEO Hier[5]: om id[Is 41 25 Ezek 24 1].

[1] Luc 0+1. [2] Luc 4+2 (+1).
[3] Luc 4+6. [4] Luc 4+4. [5] Luc 4+3.

i. 14. *AB AQUILONE Hier id [Is 14 14 (252) Ezek 40 21 Joel 2 18 Soph 2 12 Tit 2 2] Eucher [form spir int 3 2/2]: *a facie Aquilonis* [Hier [Ezek 1 4 Os 4 1 Zech 2 6]].

*PANDETUR Eucher [ib 2/2]: APERIENTUR Hier, who adds *sive exardescent*: *exardescent* id [Is ib Joel ib Soph ib Tit ib]: *exardescunt* id [Ezek 40 20, 41 8, 42 1, Os ib]: *succenditur* (in ref to the *olla*) id [Is 14 32 (264)]: *accenditur* id [Ezek 1 4].

i. 15. *COGNATIONES Hier id [Is 22 (222)].[1]

*OM τῆς γῆς Hier id [Is ib].[2]

i. 16. **et loquar* IUDICIA MEA CUM EIS Hier[3].

i. 17. **et surge* Hier: om Gaud Brix [ser 2]: *et exsurge* Ps Aug [spec 119].

*AD EOS Hier[4]: om Lucif Cal [de non parc in D. del 13 2/2]: *ad* populum Gaud Brix [ib].

**ne formides* (*timeas* Hier) *a facie eorum*: nec enim timere te faciam vultum eorum Hier: *ne timeas a fac. eo. nec* (al *ne*) *form. in conspectu eorum* Lucif Cal [ib 3/3]: so with *faciem* Ps Aug [spec 119]. Thus the corruption seems to have appeared early in the Greek, for of the accuracy of its original rendering (see critical note) we have sufficient evidence.

i. 18. *ET IN COLUMNAM FERREAM Hier[5] (om *in* Hier [ep 66 6] but the context there is very loose): om Lucif Cal [ib 13 et 14]. For Joh Cass's form of *vv.* 18, 19 see remarks on him at the end of these notes.

**aereum*: *aeneum* Hier.

*OM *firmum* Hier: *hab* Lucif Cal [ib].

[1] *π. τ. βασιλείας τῶν βασιλέων* (thus differing from both) Luc 4+2.

[2] ἀπὸ β. τ. γῆς (thus agreeing with B) Luc 3+6.

[3] *καὶ λαλήσω μετὰ κρίσεώς μου πρὸς αὐτούς* Luc 3+2.

[4] Luc 4+6. [5] Luc 4+4.

*SUPER OMNEM TERRAM Hier: om Lucif Cal ib.

*et SACERDOTIBUS Hier[1]: om Lucif Cal ib.

ii. 1. *ET FACTUM EST VERBUM DOMINI AD ME DICENS, VADE ET CLAMA IN AURIBUS IERUSALEM Hier Gildas 47.[2]

ii. 2. *DICENS Hier: et dices Gildas ib.

*miserans *adolescentiam tuam* Hier.

**et caritatem tuam* (om *et c. t.* Hier) *et caritatem desponsationis* TUAE Hier.

*IN DESERTO, IN TERRA QUAE NON SEMINATUR Hier[3].

ii. 3. **delinquunt*: *-quent* Hier.

**mala venient*: *mala* inducam Lucif Cal athan 2 1.[4]

ii. 5. **in me patres vestri* Lucif Cal de non conv c haer 8 Gildas 47: *p. v. in me* Hier Gildas 80.

ii. 6. **et inviam* (καὶ ἀβάτῳ) Hier: *et ignota* Lucif Cal ib.

*ET IMAGINEM MORTIS Hier[5]: *et sine fructu* Lucif Cal ib.

(for οὐθὲν) *VIR Hier Lucif Cal ib.

**neque habitabit homo* (om ἐκεῖ) Hier: *neque commoratus est ibi filius hominis* Lucif Cal ib.[6]

ii. 7. **in* TERRAM *Carmeli* Hier: *in Carmelum* Lucif Cal ib.

*optima: *bona* Hier Lucif Cal ib.

ii. 8. **dominus* Hier Lucif Cal ib Gildas 80: deus Ps Aug spec 46.

**et tenentes legem* Gildas ib: *et* seniores *legis* meae

[1] Luc 4 + 4. [2] Luc 4 + 4. [3] Luc 2 (+ 2) + 1.

[4] κακὰ ἀπάξω (ἐπάξω), thus differing from both M.T. and B, and supported in so doing by O. L. evidence.

[5] Luc 4 + 2.

[6] υἱὸς ἀνθρ. Luc 4 + 4, thus differing from both M.T. and B, and supported in so doing by O. L. evidence.

Lucif Cal ib: *et* cultores *legis* meae Ps Aug spec ib: *et t. legem* meam Hier: *t. l. m.* id Zech 11 8.[1]

ii. 9. *AIT DOMINUS Hier Gildas ib.[2]

ii. 10. **transite* (עִבְרוּ ἔλθετε) Hier: circuite Fulg Rusp ep 12 8.

**et considerate vehementer et videte* Hier: interrogate minis Tert adv iud 13.

ii. 11. *GENS Hier Fulg Rusp ep 12 8: *gentes* Tert ib.

**populus vero meus mutavit gloriam suam* in idolum Hier, who adds *sive de quo ei nihil proderit*; as Hier (but om *vero* and idolo) Joh Cass coll (x) de or 5 2.

ii. 12. *OBSTUPESCITE *coeli super hoc et* portae eius DESOLAMINI *vehementer* Hier: *expavit coelum super isto* Tert adv iud 13: (for חָרְבוּ) *multo magis* Cypr test 3 59: *obstupuit coelum super hoc et horruit valde* Hier ep 96 8: *o. c. s. h. et exh. terra vehementer* Hier Os 6 11: *exspectavit* (*coelum*)...*inhorruit multo vehementius* Aug con ep parm 2 20: *exhorruit coelum super haec vehementer* Ps Aug spec 144.

ii. 13. **duo enim mala*: *d. m.* Hier id ep 96 8 Ezek 47 1 Vigil Taps con varim 3 22: *d.* pessima Hier Os 10 9: *duo* haec *m.* Tert adv iud 13: haec *maligna* Cypr ib: *duo nequam* Aug ib Vigil Taps de trin 12 (Bened pag 324): haec *duo m.* Ps Aug spec ib.

**et foderunt* (om *et* Hier) Hier id Ezek 32 17, 47 1 Hos 1 1, 10 9 Am 4 7 Tert ib Cypr ib (comp *et effod* id ib 1 3 de cath eccl un 11 ep 70 1) Zen Ver 2 59 Philast de haer 20 Aug ep 2 121 12 Ps Aug spec ib Paul Nol ep 50 12 Vigil Taps de trin ib con varim ib (Cassiod Cant 4 15): *et* fecerunt Ambr Ps 61 5: *et effoderunt* Carth Conc A.D. 255 Aug con ep parm 2 20: (*ut derelinquerent*) *et foderent* Opt Mil 4 9.

[1] Luc 2 + 5. [2] Luc 4 + 6.

**cisternas*: CISTERNAS CISTERNAS Hier (Cassiod ib): *lacus* (*id est cisternas*) Hier Ezek 32 17: *lacus* Tert adv iud 13 Cypr test 1 3 3 59 de cath eccl un 11 ep 70 1 Carth Conc A.D. 255 Lact div inst 4 30 Ambr Ps 61 5 Zen Ver ib Philast ib Opt Mil ib Aug con ep parm 2 20 Ps Aug spec ib Paul Nol ib Hier Ezek 47 1 Os 1 1, 10 10 Am 4 7 Na 2 9 Vigil Taps de trin ib Bened pag 324 id con varim ib: similarly Philo de prof § 36 1 575.

**quae continere non valent aquas* Hier (Cassiod ib): *qui non poterunt aquam continere* Tert adv iud 13 Ps Aug spec 36 comp οἳ οὐ δυνήσονται συσχεῖν ὕδωρ Philo ib: *qui non poterunt aquam portare* Cypr test 1 3; so with *potuerunt* Vigil Taps 12 Bened pag 324: so with *possunt* Cypr de cath eccl un 11 ep 70 1 Zen Ver ib Aug con ep parm 2 20 Carth Conc A.D. 255: *qui non poterant aquam continere* Cypr test 3 59, but comp *poterunt portare* id ib 1 3: *qui non* habent venam Lact ib 4 30: *qui non possunt capere aquam* Philast ib: *qui non possent aquam continere* Opt Mil ib: so with *possunt* Hier Na 2 9: *quae aquas continere non possunt* Hier Ezek 32 17: so with *qui* id Am 4 7: so with *qui* and *aquam* id Ezek 47 1: *quae aquas non valent continere* id Os 1 1: *qui non possunt aquas continere* id ib 10 10: *qui non tenent aquam* Aug ep 2 121 12 Paul Nol ep 50 12: *qui aquam non possunt continere* Vigil Taps con varim ib.

ii. 18. *TURBIDAM Joh Cass coll (xxiv) de mortif 24 (J C is quoting the original and discussing its application to "*t. atque coenosum*"): *Sior* Hier: *geon* Ambr Tob 28 Ps 1 3: *aquam geon turbidam* id ep 51 5: *aquam geon* id Is 52 4 Ezek 29 3 (comp 31 introd) Os 2 5 Ab 2 15.

*FLUMINIS Hier Joh Cass ib: *fluminum* Hier Is 50 2, 52 4.

ii. 19. **arguet te* MALITIA *tua et* AVERSIO *tua increpavit* (*-pabit* Hier) *te* Hier, who adds *sive erudiet te prae-*

*varicatio tua*: *emendabit te abscessio tua* Ir c haer 4 37 7: *derelictio tua et nequitia tua* Cypr test 3 59: *arg. te pr. t. et malitia tua corripiet te* Hier Is 19 12 Bened pag 294: *corr. te pr. tua* id Ezek 5 17: M. *tua et* AVERSIO *tua* Joh Cass ib et coll (xxiii) de velle bon etc 9.

(*quia*) MALUM ET *amarum* (*est*) Hier[1]: *amarum* Cypr ib: M. ET *am.* Joh Cass coll (xxiv) ib: *quam* MALUM ET *am.* id coll (xxiii) 9 comp *q.* M. ET *am.* 16.

**te* DOMINUM *Deum tuum* Hier Joh Cass coll (xxiv) de mortif 24: *me, dicit Dominus* Cypr ib.

**et non* ESSE TIMOREM MEI APUD TE Hier: so, with *meum*, Joh Cass ib: *et non* speraveris in me Cypr ib.

**Dominus Deus* EXERCITUUM Hier: *D. D. tuus* (loosely) Cypr ib: *Dominus* Joh Cass ib.

ii. 20. **confregisti...rupisti* Hier Gildas 47: *contribulasti...dirupisti* Cypr ib.

**non serviam* (om σοί) Hier Cypr ib Gildas ib.

**prosternebaris* Hier: *confundar* Cypr ib: *diffundar* Hier Os 4 10.

ii. 21. **vineam electam* Hier Faustus de grat 1 12 Prim Adrum Apoc 3 Gildas 47: *v. fructiferam* Ambr de fide 4 165 Ps 36 9 Hier Is 5 1, 32 9 Ab 3 17 Fulg Rusp ad mon 1 23: *vitem fruct.* Hier tr hom or 13 (866): *vineam frugiferam* Ruf Aqu ben rub Hier Ezek 15 1 Mic 4 8 Zach 14 15 Mal 3 7: *vitem fructuosam* Ambr Luc 6 20 Paul Nol ep 10 2: *vitem universam fructiferam* Ps Aug spec 112: *v. veram* Fac Herm def tr 11 3.

**omne* SEMEN *verum* Hier id Faust ib Gildas ib: om Ambr de fide 4 165 Prim Adrum ib: *totam* feracem Ruf Aqu ib: *totam veram* Ambr Ps 36 9 Hier Is 5 1, 32 9 Mic 4 8 Ab 3 17 Zach 14 15: *universam v.* Hier tr hom or xiii (866): *vineam veram*

[1] πικρὸν καὶ πον. Luc 3 + 1.

Hier Mat 15 13, 26 29, 27 34 : *veram* Ps Aug spec ib : *omnem veram* (Hier Ezek 15 1) Hier Mal 3 7 : om *πᾶσ. ἀληθ.* (Ambr Luc 6 20, but see above) Paul Nol ep 10 2 Fulg Rusp ib.

*om *mihi* Ambr de fide ib Ruf Aqu ib Paul Nol ib Hier tr hom or ib Is 5 1, 32 9 Ezek 15 1 Ab 3 17 Mat ib Ps Aug ib Faustus de grat 1 12 Fulg Rusp ib Prim Adrum ib Gildas ib : *hab* Hier.

*IN PRAVUM *vinea aliena* Hier Gildas ib : *in amaritudinem* VITIS ALIENAE Ambr de fide ib Ruf Aqu ib Hier Is 32 9 Ezek 15 1 Ab 3 17 Mat ib Ps Aug spec ib Paul Nol ib Faustus ib Fulg Rusp ib Prim Adrum ib : *in am. vinea aliena* Hier Is 5 1 : *in am. vitis aliena* Hier tr hom or ib Aug Ps 55 1 Joh § 80 1 Faustus ib.

ii. 22. **in iniquita*TE *tu*A Hier: *in iniquitatibus tuis* id tr hom or 18 (867 *bis*) : *contritiones vestras* Ps Aug spec 23 : *iniqu. tua* Gildas ib.

ii. 23. **post* BAHALIM Hier : *p. Bahal* Prisc 19.

**ambulavi* : *abii* Hier Prisc ib.

**vias suas* Hier : *v. tuas* Prisc ib.

ii. 24. *ASSUETUS *in solitudine* : ASS. *solitudini* Hier.

ii. 25. *A NUDITATE Hier : *ab aspera via* Lucif Cal de non conv cum haer 8 Hier ep 122 1 : *a v. aspera* Hier ep 12 2 Is 57 10.

**et* DIXISTI Hier : *quae autem dixit* Lucif Cal ib.

*DESPERAVI, NEQUAQUAM FACIAM Hier : *confortabor* Lucif Cal ib.[1]

ii. 26. *CONFUSI SUNT Hier : *confundentur* Lucif Cal ib.

*DOMUS Hier : *filii* Lucif Cal ib.

ii. 27. *DICENTES *ligno, Pater meus es tu ; et lapidi, Tu me genuisti* Hier Aug Ps 65 17, 113 4 : *ligno dixerunt quia pater meus es tu ; et lapidi* : *Tu g. me* Cypr test 3 59 : *dicit*

[1] *οὐ βούλομαι* Luc 4 + 2, thus agreeing with M.T. rather than B.

*lap.*, *P. m. es tu* Ambr de off min 1 117 [*noli ligno dicere, P. m. es tu* id Luc 7 13 Bened pag 1463]: *lig. dixerunt, P. m. es tu; et lap., Tu gen. me* Hier ep 122 1.

**verterunt ad me tergum et non faciem* Hier Jus Urgell in Cant expl 49: so, with *dorsa sua* Hier ep pach 5: so, with *dorsa* and *f. suas* id Zach 7 8: *converterunt ad me dorsum et n. f. suam* (loosely) Cypr ib: so, without *suam*, Aug Ps 113 introd: *convert. ad me dorsum* Ruf Aqu ben iud 1: *v. contra me* scapulam recedentem (loosely) Hier Ezek 8 15.

ii. 28. *SURGANT *et* LIBERENT Hier: RESURGANT *et* SALVAM...FACIANT Hier Is 57 12.

*TE Hier id ib.[1]

ii. 29. **quid vultis mecum* IUDICIO CONTENDERE Hier id ep 132 20 Aug Ps 142 2 de pecc mer 2 14 Eugip exc aug 1 Gildas 47: *ut quid loquimini ad me* Lucif Cal de non conv cum haer 8.

**omnes dereliquistis me* (*me der.* Gildas) *dicit Dominus* Hier Aug Ps 142 2 Gildas ib: *omnes vos impie egistis et o. vos deliquistis in me, d. D.* Lucif Cal ib.

ii. 30. **frustra* Hier Am 4 4 Aug ep 93 3 Joh Cass coll (vi) de nece san 11 Gildas ib: *sine causa* Cypr ad dem 7 Hier Is 1 5. 9 8 Soph 2 1 Mal 3 6 Aug con ep parm 2 29 Ps Aug spec 32.

*RECEPERUNT Hier Aug ep ib con ep parm ib Gildas ib: EXCEPERUNT Cypr ib: *recepistis* Hier Is 1 5, 9 8 Am ib Soph ib Mal ib Ps Aug spec ib Joh Cass ib.

ii. 31 [30]. *VIDETE Hier: *audite* Gildas 47.

*OM τάδε λέγει Κύρ. Hier Gildas ib.

**terra* SEROTINA Hier Gildas ib: *t. in incultum derelicta* Tert marc 4 31.

*recessimus Hier Gildas ib.

ii. 33. *MALITIAS TUAS DOCUISTI Hier: *tu malignatus es ut coinquinares* Lucif Cal pro ath 2 1.

[1] Luc 4 + 4.

ii. 37. **nihil habebis prosperum* Salv [de gub 7 11] : *n. in ea hab. pr.* Hier.

iii. 1. Si reliquerit uxor virum suum, et alii nupserit, et voluerit postea reverti ad eum: numquid suscipiet eam, et non detestabitur? *pro quo scriptum est iuxta Hebraicam veritatem, quod in Graecis et Latinis codicibus non habetur* Et tu reliquisti me; tamen convertere, et suscipiam te, dicit Dominus Hier [ep 122 2], an extraordinarily loose rendering.

iii. 2. *(*in*) *directum* Hier[1].

iii. 3. *frons* Hier: *facies* Hier [ep 117 9 Ezek 7 18 Os 2 5] Eucher [form spir int 6] Vigil Taps [con eut 1 4].

*OM *πρὸς πάντας* Hier id [ib].[2]

iii. 4. **ergo saltem* AMODO *voca me*: *pater meus, dux virginitatis meae tu es* (*es tu* Hier) Hier: *non ut* Dominum *me vocasti neque ut patrem et principem virg. tuae* Hier [Is 54 1] (very loose): *non ut* Dom. *me invocasti aut pat. aut prin. v. tuae* id [Os 2 19]: *non ut* Dom. *me voc. et patr. et prin. v. t.* id [Ioel 1 8]. Comp. οὐχ ὡς οἶκόν με ἐκάλεσας, καὶ πατέρα, καὶ ἄνδρα τῆς παρθενίας σου Philo [de cherub § 14 i 148], where Dr Ryle (p. 298) points out that Philo is laying stress on the reading ἄνδρα.

iii. 6. *AVERSATRIX *Israel* Hier: *habitatio domus Israel* id [tr hom or xiv (869 et 873)] Gaud Brix [ser 8].

*FRONDOSUM Hier: *nemorosum* id [ib] Gaud Brix [ib]: (*frondoso* Hier [Os 4 10], but this is rather a citation of ii. 20. See crit. note there).

**et* FORNICATA EST *ibi* Hier: so, with *illic* for *ibi* id [ib] Gaud Brix [ib]: *et fornicati sunt ibi* (Hier [ep 22 1]. See previous note)[3].

[1] om εἰς εὐθ. Luc 3 + 1. [2] Luc 0 + 1.

[3] ἐπόρνευσεν Luc 3 + 5, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

iii. 7. *FECISSET Hier: *fornicata est* id [ep ib] Gaud Brix [ib]: *forn. es* [lib de poenit ap ambr 10], but *forn. est* [ib 22]: *fornicati sunt* Hier [Os 4 10].

**convertere* Hier: *revertere* Gaud Brix [ib] Hier [ep ib Os ib].

*SOROR EIUS *Iuda* Hier[1].

iii. 8. *OM *εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς* Hier (so Gaud Brix [ib], but his omission is not significant, as these closing words are not wanted to complete the sense): *in manu eius* id [tr hom or xiv (870)]: so with *manus* id [ib].

*SOROR EIUS Hier id [(870)] but om id [ib (870 et 875)].[2]

iii. 9. **et facilitate fornicationis suae contaminavit terram* Hier: *et facta est fornicatio eius in nihilum* id [ib].

*CUM LAPIDE ET LIGNO Hier[3]: *lignum et lapidem* Cypr [ep 63 18]: *in lignum et lapidem* Hier [Is 57 4].

iii. 10. *SOROR EIUS Hier: om id [tr hom or (870 et 876 *ter*)].[4]

*AIT DOMINUS Hier: om id [ib].[5]

iii. 11. *AVERSATRIX Hier: om id [(870)].[6]

iii. 12. *OM *πρὸς μέ* Hier: *hab* Tycon [reg 7 (p. 75)] Hier [Zach 2 6] Auct qu ex utr test [102].

*AVERSATRIX Hier: *habitatio* Hier [Zach ib].

**ait*: *dicit* Hier id [Zach ib] Auct qu ex utr test [ib].

*avertam Hier, who adds *sive firmabo*: *firmabo* Auct qu ex utr test [ib].

*OM *ὑμῖν* Hier: *hab* Auct qu ex utr test [ib].

iii. 15. *SCIENTIA Hier Ferreolus [reg ad mon 37]: *pascentes* Cypr [test 1 14 3 66 de hab virg 1 ep 4 1] Lucif Cal [ath 1 2 1 22 2 3 de non parc in D. del 11 ib 22] Aug [con cresc don 3 8]: om Aug [ser 46 23 ib 313 2].

[1] *Ἰουδὰ ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτῆς* Luc 4 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T.

[2] Luc 4 + 2, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

[3] Luc 3 (+ 1) + 1 (+ 1).

[4] Luc 4 + 2 (+ 1).

[5] Luc 3 + 3.

[6] Luc 4 + 2.

*ET *doctrina* Hier Ferreolus ib : *cum disciplina* Cypr ib Lucif Cal ib Aug con cresc don ib ser 46 23 ib 313 2.

iii. 16. *NEQUE (NEC Hier) RECORDABUNTUR ILLIUS Hier[1].

iii. 17. *IN TEMPORE ILLO Hier: *in illis diebus et in t. i.* Prim Adrum in Apoc 3.

*IN NOMINE DOMINI IN IERUSALEM Hier[2]: om *in Ier* Prim Adrum ib.

iii. 19. *PRAECLARAM Hier[3].

**voca*BIS, *cessa*BIS Hier Joh Cass coll (xiii) de prob dei 8.

iii. 20. **amatorem suum* Hier Joh Cass ib: *virum suum* Hier ep 69 5.

**contempsit* Hier Joh Cass ib: *despicit* Hier ib.

iii. 22. **et sanabo* Hier id Ezek 47 6 Na 2 9: *et ego sanabo* id Is 51 9.

*AVERSIONES *vestras* Hier: *contritiones v.* id Is ib Ezek ib Na ib: *tribulationem vestram* lib de poenit ap ambr 25.

*ECCE NOS VENIMUS AD TE Hier[4].

iv. 3. *ET IERUSALEM Hier: *et qui inhabitant Hier.* Cypr test 1 8: *et qui inh. in Hier.* Lact de div inst 4 17: *et omnibus qui habitant in Ier.* Zen Ver 1 13 6: *et habitatori* (al *-ibus*) Hier Joh Cass coll (iv) de conc car et spir 19.

iv. 4. *DOMINO Hier: *deo vestro* Tert marc 1 20 Cypr ib Lact ib (one MS. *dom. deo v.*) Hier Eph 2 12: *deo* Tert adv iud 3: om *Dom. d. v.* Zen Ver ib.

*ET AUFERTE Hier: (*circumcidimini deo*) *et circumcidite* Tert adv iud 3: *et circumcidimini* id marc 1 20 4 1 v 4: (*circumcidite vos deo vestro*) *et circumcidite* Cypr ib Lact ib: et

[1] Luc 4 + 2 add ἐν αὐτῇ. [2] Luc 3 (+ 1) + 3.

[3] ὀνομαστήν Luc 4 + 1, agreeing with M.T.

[4] οἵδε (with Q; see critical note) Luc 2 + 4, thus agreeing with M.T. rather than B.

nolite circumcidere carnem praeputii vestri Hier [Eph 2 12]: om Zen Ver[ib].[1]

**indignatio* MEA Hier: *ira* MEA Cypr[ib] Lact[ib] Zen Ver[ib].

iv. 7. **de cubili suo* Hier: *de* Iordane Hier[Zach 11 3].

*ET *praedo* Hier[2].

**terram* TUAM Hier[3].

**civitates* TUAE Hier[4].

iv. 8. **ira* FURORIS Hier[5]: *ira* Ps Aug[spec 23].

iv. 10. **heu heu heu* Hier. See on i. 6.

**erit* VOBIS Hier[6].

**et ecce pervenit* Hier[7].

iv. 11. **urens* Hier, who adds *sive roris*: but see crit. note.

iv. 12. *EX HIS Hier[8].

**loqu*AR Hier (אֲדַבֵּר, λαλῶ; Q has -λήσω)[9].

iv. 14. *MORABUNTUR Hier Joh Cass[coll (vii) de an mob 4]: *erunt* Ps Aug[spec 23].[10]

iv. 19. *VENTREM MEUM 2° Hier id[Ezek 3 3] Ambr[ob val 29 fug saec 42]: om Ambr[ep 36] Eucher[form spir int 7].

**sensus cordis mei turbati sunt in me* Hier: *s. c. m. conturbant me* id[Ezek ib]: *s. c. m. conturbati sunt* Eucher[ib].

[1] *τὴν ἀκροβ. τ. καρδίας ὑμῶν* (*ἡμῶν*) Luc 3 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T., but one Luc MS. (51) has *τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν τ. κ. ὑμ.*

[2] Luc 1 + 2.

[3] *τὴν γῆν σου*, Luc 3 + 6, thus agreeing with M.T.

[4] ins. *σου* Luc 3 + 5.

[5] Luc 1 + 5.

[6] Luc 4 + 6.

[7] om *ἰδοὺ* Luc 0 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T.

[8] Luc 4 + 4.

[9] *λαλήσω* Luc 4 + 6.

[10] *ὑπάρξουσιν* Luc 3 (+ 1) + 4.

iv. 20. *TABERNACULA MEA Hier[1].

iv. 21. *AUDIAM Hier[2].

iv. 22. *STULTUS Hier Gildas 47 : *duces* Hier Mic 7 7.

iv. 29. **omnis civitas* (1° כָּל־הָעִיר) Hier, who adds *sive regio*.

*universae urbes Hier[3].

iv. 30. *VASTATA Hier[4].

**quaer*ENT Hier[5].

v. 1. **et considerate et quaerite* Hier: om *et cons.* id adv pel 2 26 : *et quaer....et cognoscite*, inverting order, Aug quaest in hept 1 40 Eugip exc Aug 74.

*VIRUM Hier id adv pel ib : HOMINEM Aug ib Eugip ib.[6]

*om אִם יֵשׁ Hier id adv pel ib Aug ib Eugip ib.

**eis* : EI Hier[7] : propter eum id adv pel ib : peccatis eorum Aug ib Eugip ib.

v. 2. *QUODSI ETIAM Hier: QUAMVIS ENIM id adv pel ib.

**et hoc falso iurabunt* Hier: fraudulenter (=לֹא כֵן) IURANT, *et hoc ipsum in mendacio* id adv pel ib.

v. 3. **respiciunt fidem* Hier Gildas 48.

v. 4. **dei* SUI Hier[8].

[1] ins μου Luc 3 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T.

[2] Luc 4 + 5 against the ptcp ἀκούων, but two MSS. (23, 90) have ἀκούω instead of the future. Thus on the whole Luc agrees with M.T.

[3] πᾶσα χώρα Luc 4 + 2 (thus agreeing with B against M.T.).

[4] ἡ ταλαιπ. Luc 4 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

[5] Luc 0 + 3.

[6] ἄνδρα Luc 4 + 5, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

[7] αὐτῇ Luc 4 + 4, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

[8] Luc 3 + 2.

v. 6. *AD VESPERAM Hier Cassiod Ps 101 11: *usque ad domos* id Na 2 11.[1]

v. 7. **saturavi* Hier[2].

v. 8. **emissarii* Hier: om Ir c haer 4 41 3, 5 8 2 Hier de perp virg 8 adv Iov 2 37 Ezek 8 10 Zach 9 5 Ps Aug spec 45 Salv de gub 7 4, but id ib 4 24 has *insanientes* (without *emiss*) and so Hier ubique.

v. 11. *AIT (DICIT Hier) DOMINUS Hier[3].

v. 13. **haec ergo venient* (*even.* Hier) *illis* Hier[4].

v. 14. *DEUS Hier[5].

v. 17. καὶ τοὺς ἐλαιῶνας ὑμῶν[6].

*TU HABES *fiduciam* (TU *fid.* HAB. Hier) Hier (אַתָּה בֹּטֵחַ, ὑμεῖς πεποίθατε)[7].

v. 19. *DERELIQUISTIS ME ET[8].

v. 22. **et a facie mea non dolebitis* Hier who adds, *sive timebitis* Gildas 48: om Ambr hexam 3 2 11 (shewing that he sometimes quoted from memory): *a f. m. n. formidabitis* Hier Is 51 13.

v. 23. **recesserunt* (סָרוּ, καὶ ἐξέκλιναν; B* vid Q om καὶ) Hier Gildas ib.[9]

v. 24. **serotinam* Hier[10].

[1] ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν (MS. 144 has ὡς τ. οἰ.) Luc 3+1, an example of a conjectural emendation, supported by Luc MSS. and based on O', without any connexion with the Heb.

[2] καὶ ὥρκιζον αὐτοὺς Luc 3+2. [3] om Luc 4+5.

[4] So Luc 4+3(+1), thus agreeing with M.T. and B.

[5] Luc 3+1(+1), thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

[6] Luc 1(+1).

[7] σὺ πέποιθας Luc 3+2, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

[8] Luc 3+6, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

[9] om καὶ Luc 3+4.

[10] ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ (a double rendering of בְּעִתּוֹ) inserted between ὀψ. and κατὰ καιρὸν by Luc 4+2.

v. 26. **impii* Hier Gildas [48]: impietates Ps Aug [spec 29].

*INSIDIANTES QUASI AUCUPES *laqueos* (יָשׁוּר כְּשַׁךְ יְקוּשִׁים) Hier Gildas [ib]: et loquentes vana Epp Decret S. Stephano adscr. This rendering appears to represent some such Heb. as כְּשִׂיחֵי קַשׁ. If so, it has the interest of preserving an attempt at the emendation of a deeply-seated corruption in M.T.

v. 28. *INCRASSATI SUNT ET IMPINGUATI Hier Gildas [ib].[1]

*SERMONES meos pessime Hier Gildas [ib].[2]

v. 30. **stupor et mirabilia facta sunt in terra* Hier Gildas [80]: *pavor et horrenda facta sunt super terram* Aug [de doct chr 4 30]: *horribilia f. s. s. t.* Ps Aug [spec 46].

v. 31. **applaudebant manibus suis* Hier Gildas [ib]: *plausum dederunt m. s.* Aug [ib] (with whom the whole *v.* differs a good deal in detail from Vulg.): *plauserunt m. s.* Ps Aug [spec ib].

vi. 7. **aquam* SUAM Hier: om *suam* id [Is 14 15 Bened pag 253].

vi. 13. **et a* PROPHETA *usque ad* SACERDOTES (-DOTEM Hier Gil) Hier Gildas [80]: *a sacerdote u. a. pseudo-prophetam* Ps Aug [spec 46] Faust et Marc [lib prec 33].

vi. 14. **et* NON Hier id [adv iov 2 37] Aug [Ps 147 14]: *et ubi* Ambr [Ps 118 D 14] Hier [ep 82] Aug [con litt pet 2 157] Ps Aug [spec ib] Faust et Marc [ib] Gildas [ib]: CUM NON ESSET Fac ep Herm [con moc].

[1] *ἐλιπάνθησαν, ἐστεατώθησαν* Luc 4 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

[2] *τοὺς λόγους μου εἰς πονηρόν* (before *κρίσιν* 1°) Luc 3 + 2, thus supporting a modified form of M.T. against B.

vi. 15. *_quia_ (_qui_ Gil) ABOMINATIONEM FECERUNT Hier Gildas [ib]: _defecerunt_ Faust et Marc [ib].

*ERUBESCERE Hier Gildas [ib]: _ignominiam suam_ Faust et Marc [ib].

*INTER RUENTES Hier Gildas [ib]: _in ruina sua_ Faust et Marc [ib].

*_visitationis suae_ Hier: om _s._ Faust et Marc [ib]: so, with _eorum_, Gildas [ib].

*CORRUENT Hier Gildas [ib]: _infirmabuntur_ Faust et Marc [ib] (see critical note).

vi. 16. *OM Κυρίου Hier id [Na 2 2] Ambr [Ps 118 ה 22]: _Domini_ Hil [Ps 118 3] Hier [Is 3 13] Ps Aug [spec 5] Cassiod [Ps 127 1]: _dei_ Hil [Ps 127 1. 137 4].

*OM καὶ ἴδετε 2° Hier id [Is ib]: _et quaerite_ Hil [Ps 118 3]: _et videte_ Ambr [ib] Hil [Ps 127 1, 137 4] Hier [Na ib] Ps Aug [spec ib] Cassiod [ib]: _quaerite_ (_viam bonam_; loosely) Hier [Is 57 10].

*refrigerium Hier: _purificationem_ id [Is 57 10]: _sanctificationem_ Ps Aug [spec ib].

vi. 18. *AUDITE Hier, who adds _sive audiverunt_: _audierunt_ Ir [c haer 4 36 2]; _audient_ Cypr [test 1 21].

*CONGREGATIO, _quanta ego faciam eis_ Hier, who adds to _congreg._, _sive qui pascitis greges_: _et qui pascunt pecora in eis_ Ir [ib]: so with _pascent_ Cypr [ib].

vi. 20. *_affertis_ (תָּבוֹא φέρετε) Hier Ir [c haer 4 17 2].

vi. 26. *_super_ NOS Hier, who adds _sive super vos._

vi. 28. *_principes declinant_ (_-nantes_ Hier) Hier: _pr. declinantium_ Gildas [80].

vi. 29. *_defecit_ Hier Joh Cass [coll (vi) de nece san 11] Gildas [ib].

*_consumptum est plumbum_ Hier: om Joh Cass [ib] Gildas [ib].

**malitiae enim* (*autem* for *enim* Gildas) *eorum non sunt consumptae* Hier Gildas [ib]: so with vestrae for *eorum* Joh Cass [ib].

vi. 30. **vocate* Hier Joh Cass [ib]: (*argentum vestrum*) reprobum est Ambr [Luc 22 57].

vii. 2. *QUI INGREDIMINI PER PORTAS HAS, UT ADORETIS DOMINUM Hier: om Ir [4 17 2].

vii. 3. **Dominus* EXERCITUUM Hier: om EX. Ir [ib].

vii. 4. *OM ὅτι...ὑμᾶς Hier Salv [de gub 7 11]: *quia* (*quoniam* Ir) *in totum non proderunt vobis* Ir [ib] Ps Aug [spec 5].

**templum Domini, templum Domini* Ir [ib] Hier [ep 58 3 adv iov 2 37]: T. D. T. D. T. D. Hier Salv [ib].

· **est* Hier Ir [ib] Salv [ib]: om Hier [adv iov ib].

vii. 5. **bene direxeritis* Salv [ib]: *benedixeritis* Hier: *emundate* Ir [4 36 2]: *emendantes emendabitis* Lucif Cal [de ath 2 1].

vii. 11. *FACTA EST Hier: EST Lucif Cal [ib].

**domus* ISTA Hier, who adds *sive mea*: *d. mea* Lucif Cal [ib].

vii. 13. *DICIT DOMINUS Hier Gildas [80].

*MANE CONSURGENS ET LOQUENS Hier Gildas [ib]: *ante lucem* Cassiod [Ps 126 3], but this perhaps is a reminiscence of *v.* 25 or of xxv. 4.

*AUDISTIS Hier Gildas [ib] Cassiod [ib].

vii. 14. **faciam* om *et* Hier Gildas [ib]: *et fac.* Ambr [ep 40 14].

**domui huic* Hier Gildas [ib]: *domui* Ambr [ib].

vii. 15. *OMNES *fratres vestros* Hier: *f. v.* Ambr [ib].

vii. 16. **nec* ASSUMAS *pro eis* LAUDEM *et orationem* (OM κ. μ. εὐ.), *et non obsistas mihi* Hier: *et ne postulaveris pro his* IN PRECE *et oratione* (OM κ. μ. εὐ.) Tert [pud 2]: *et noli postulare illis misericordiam* (OM κ. μ. εὐ.) Ambr [ib]: *nec* ASSUMAS *pro eis deprecationem* (OM κ. μ. εὐ.) *et non*

*obsistas mihi* (much closer to M.T. than to O′) Hier [adv iov 2 30]: *et ne postulaveris misereri illius, et non accesseris ad me pro eis* Fac ep Herm [pro def tr 12 5].

*TE Hier id [adv iov ib Dan 9 2] Ambr [ib] Fac ep Herm [ib]: om *te* Tert [ib].

vii. 18. *REGINAE *coeli* Hier, who adds *sive militiae*: militiae c. id [Is 57 6].

vii. 21. *EXERCITUUM, DEUS ISRAEL Hier: om Ir [c haer 4 17 3] Auct qu ex utr test [103].

vii. 23. *IN OMNI VIA Hier: *in omnibus viis meis* Ir [ib] Tert [marc 4 31].

vii. 24. *(*et non*) AUDIERUNT Hier Tert [ib]: OBAUDIERUNT Ir [ib].

**nec inclinav*ERUNT *aurem suam* Hier: *nec intend*ERUNT Ir [ib]: *et non advert*ERUNT *au. s.* Tert [ib], the last adding however exegetically, *et non intendit auribus suis.*

**in* VOLUNTATIBUS *suis* (om *suis* Hier) *et in* (om *in* Hier) *pravitate* Hier: *in cogitationibus* (*cordis malitiae suae*) Ir [ib]: *in iis quae concupiverunt* (*corde suo malo*) Tert [ib].

vii. 25. **et misi* Hier Ir [4 36 5] Ambr [Luc 15 17]: *et emisi* Tert [ib]: *mittebam* Max Taur [ser 4].

**per* (*hanc* Hier) *diem, consurgens diluculo* Hier: *inter diem et ante lucem* Ir [ib]: *ante lucem* [Tert [ib]] Ambr [ib] Max Taur [ib] Cassiod [Ps 126 3], but this perhaps is a reminiscence of xxv. 5. (See on *v.* 13.)

vii. 26. **et* PEIUS OPERATI SUNT (*quam patres eorum*) Hier: om *et peius...eorum* Ir [ib]: om *et p. o. s.* Tert [ib].

vii. 27. *OMNIA...EOS Hier Gildas [49]: hunc sermonem Ir [ib].

vii. 28. *HAEC EST GENS Hier Gildas [ib]: *hoc genus* Ir [ib].

**Domini* DEI SUI Hier Gildas ib: *Domini* Ir ib Ps Aug spec 32.

*ET ABLATA EST Hier Gildas ib: om Ir ib Ps Aug spec ib.

vii. 29. *FURORIS SUI Hier: *facientem haec* Ir 4 36 2.

viii. 4. **numquid qui cadet* (*al. cadit*) *non resurget?* Hier id Am 8 11 Ps Aug spec 23: so with *cadit* Hier tr hom or Is 51 12 Ezek 27 Mic 7 8 ep 78 Lucif Cal de reg apos 12 Joh Cass coll (xiii) de prof dei 3 Prosp Aqu adv coll 2 Bach Mon de rep 21 Fulg Rusp ep 7 8 Gildas 49: *qui ceciderit resurget* Tert poenit 8: *numquid qui cadit* (but Cod A has *cadet*) *non resurget?* Cypr test 3 114: *n. q. cadit* non adiiciet *ut resurgat?* Ambr Ps 36 24: *nonne qui ceciderit resurget?* Pac ep 1 5 par ad poenit 12 *n. q. cadet non surget?* Hier Is 51 9.

viii. 5. *IN IERUSALEM Hier Fulg Rusp ib Joh Cass ib and 7 Gildas ib: om Ps Aug spec ib.

**contentiosa* Hier (see critical note) Joh Cass ib 3 et 7 Fulg Rusp ib Gildas ib: *malignam* Ps Aug spec ib.

*APPREHENDERUNT Hier Gildas ib: TENUERUNT Ps Aug spec ib: INDURAVERUNT Joh Cass ib 3 et 7 Fulg Rusp ib.

*MENDACIUM Hier Gildas ib: *praesumptionem* Ps Aug spec ib: facies suas Joh Cass ib: cervices suas Fulg Rusp ib Joh Cass ib 3.

viii. 6. *ATTENDI ET AUSCULTAVI Hier Gildas ib: *praebete ergo aurem et audite* Ps Aug spec ib.

*NEMO QUOD BONUM EST (loquitur) Hier Gildas ib: om Ps Aug spec ib.

*OMNES CONVERSI SUNT Hier Gildas ib: *defecit quia currebat* Ps Aug spec ib.

*IN PROELIO: AD PROELIUM Hier: *in hinnitu suo* Ps Aug spec ib: IN PROELIUM Gildas ib.

viii. 7. **et hirundo* ET CICONIA Hier id Is 38 15 Gildas

49: *et hir.* (*hyr* Cypr) *ruris* (*agri* for *ruris* Ambr) Cypr[test 1 3] Ambr[hex 6 4 20 ep 23 6]: *et hir. et ru.* (*pass.*) Lact[div inst 4 11]: *et hir. cui cellae agri* Ps Aug[spec ib].

*IUDICIUM Hier Cypr[ib] Lact[ib] Ps Aug[spec ib] Gildas[ib]: *iudicia* Ambr[hex 6 4 20].

viii. 8. *VERE (אָכֵן הִנֵּה) Hier: om Cypr[ib] Lact[ib] Ps Aug[spec 46].

**mendacium* OPERATUS EST Hier: *in cassum facta est* Cypr[ib] Lact[ib]: *in vanum f. e.* Ps Aug[spec ib], (adding metatura vestra).

N.B. *scribae confusi sunt* Cypr[ib] Ps Aug[spec ib] differing from M.T. and O''s division הביֹשׁו : ספרים.

viii. 9. **verbum* Hier Cypr[ib] Lact[ib] Ps Aug[ib] Salv[de gub 4 1].

viii. 16. *AUDITUS EST Hier (id[de ben iac patr]): *audiemus* Ir[5 30 2].

*FREMITUS Hier (id[de ben etc]): *vocem velocitatis* Ir[ib], (adding *equorum eius*).

*(*hinnituum*) PUGNATORUM *eius* Hier: *hinnitus* (*decursionis*) *equorum eius* Ir[ib].

**et* VENERUNT *et* DEVORAVERUNT Hier: *et veniet et manducabit* Ir[ib].

viii. 17. *REGULOS Hier Joh Cass[coll (xviii) de trib gen mon 16 bis].

viii. 21. *CONTRITUS SUM Hier Gildas[49], but G. omits **et contristatus* of Hier.

viii. 22. *(*quare igitur non*) *est obducta cicatrix* Hier Joh Cass[coll (iii) de trib abren 8]: ASCENDIT *sanitas* Ambr[de lap virg 33]: ASC. *curatio* Hier[Ier 22 8 Ezek 27 17]: ASC. *sanatio* [Ezek 47 6]: *obd. est cic.* Gildas[ib].

viii. 23 [ix. 1]. *OM τὸν λαόν μου τοῦτον Hier id[ep 39]

[et 98 25] Joh Cass [coll (ix) de orat 29] Gildas [35 et 49] Siric [ep 1 7]: *hanc plebem* Chrom Aqu [Mat Tract 3 3]: *populum istum* Hier [ep 122 1]: *pop. hunc* Cypr [apol adv Theod] ap Mar Merc [xi resp orth] Dion Exig. [ep decr p sir 7]: (*et plorabo*) istud Fac ep Herm [pro def tr 2 4].

ix. 1 [2]. *in solitudinem* (*-ne* Hier) *diversorium* (al. *in diversorio* for *in sol. div.* Hier) VIATORUM Hier Gildas [49]: *in deserto habitationem novissimam* Ir [4 25 3].

ix. 2 [3]. **extenderunt* Hier Gildas [ib]: *extendit* Lucif Cal [athan 2 1]: *extendit* (*lingua eius mendacium et non fidem*) Fac ep Herm [pro def tr 2 4].

**quasi arcum* Hier Gildas [ib]: *sicut a.* Lucif Cal [ib].

**mendacii* Hier Gildas [ib]: *in falso* Lucif Cal [ib]: *mendacium* Ps Aug [spec 43].

**et non veritatis*: *confortati sunt* Hier Gildas [ib]: *et fides non invaluit* Lucif Cal [ib]: *et non f. inv.* Ps Aug [spec ib].

**quia de ma*LO *ad* (*in* Hier) *mal*UM *egressi sunt* Hier Gildas [ib]: *quia* de (a Ps Aug) malis mala exierunt Lucif Cal [ib] Ps Aug [spec ib].

*DICIT DOMINUS Hier Gildas [ib]: om Lucif Cal [ib] Ps Aug [spec ib].

ix. 4 [5]. *ET *veritatem* Hier id [Zach 8 10] (but he goes on loosely, *non loquitur*): om *et* Lucif Cal [ib].

*DOCUERUNT Hier, who adds, *sive didicit* Aug [Ps 139 10]: *didicit* Hier [Zach ib] Lucif Cal [ib].

ix. 4 [5], 5 [6]. *(*ut inique agerent*) LABORAVERUNT (so Aug [ib]). HABITATIO TUA IN MEDIO (DOLI) Hier: *reverti uoluerunt et non obreliquerunt usuram super usuram* (DOLUM SUPER DOLUM) Lucif Cal [ib]: *ut...lab.* (as Vulg.) Joh Cass [coll (xxiii) de velle bon etc 1 5]: *laborant* (*ut inique agant*) Gildas [68].

ix. 5 [6]. *DICIT DOMINUS Hier Lucif Cal [ib].

ix. 6 [7]. **Dominus* EXERCITUUM Hier: om *exerc.* Lucif Cal [ib].

*QUID (*enim aliud faciam*)? Hier: (*quia*) sic *faciam* Lucif Cal [ib].

*OM πονηρίας: (*a facie filiæ sive a fac.*) *malitiæ* (*fil.*) Hier: *malignitatis* Lucif Cal [ib].

ix. 7 [8]. **vulnerans* Hier Lucif Cal [ib] Ps Aug [spec 15].

**dolum locuta est*; *in ore suo* Hier: *maligna verba oris eorum* Lucif Cal [ib]: *dolosa v. o. e.* Ps Aug [spec ib].

**insidias* Hier: *inimicitiam* Lucif Cal [ib] Ps Aug [spec ib].

ix. 8 [9]. **visitabo* Hier Lucif Cal [ib] Ps Aug [spec ib].

*om בָּם Hier Lucif Cal [ib] Ps Aug [spec ib].

ix. 9 [10]. *ASSUMAM Hier, who adds *sive assumite*: *accipite* Ambr [de fide 3 119] Vigil Taps [Trin 5 Bened pag 247 c. varim 1 44]: *accipe* (al. *accipite*) Vict Vit [de pers 3 2].

*AC LAMENTUM Hier: om Ambr [ib] Vigil Taps [ib] Vict Vit [ib].

*INCENSA SUNT Hier, who adds *sive defecerunt*: *defecerunt* Ambr [ib] Vigil Taps [ib] Vict Vit [ib].

*PERTRANSIENS Hier: om Ambr [ib] Vigil Taps [ib] Vict Vit [ib].

ix. 12 [13]. *OM πρός με Hier Gildas [49].

*ET NON AMBULAVERUNT IN EA Hier Gildas [ib].

ix. 13 [14]. *PRAVITATEM Hier Gildas [ib].

*OM τῆς κακῆς Hier Gildas [ib].

ix. 20 [21]. *(*fenestras*) NOSTRAS Hier id [ep 22 26 adv iov 2 8 Ioel 2 1 Abd 11 Na 3 13 interp hom or in Cant 2 Bened pag 529] (but in all but [Ioel] there is a variant *vestras*): *per fenestram* (om. pron) Ambr [de fug saec 1 3]: so *-tras* id [Ps 118 42]: *fen. vestras* Hier [Ezek 20 7] Paul Nol [ep 41 2] (but one MS. *nostras*) Maxim Taur [hom 78].

ix. 23 [24]. (*nosse*) ME Hier Salv [de gub 7 11]: om *me* Ir [c haer 4 17 3] Cypr [test 3 10] Hil [Ps 123 2] Zen Ver [1 3 2] Aug

[ep 55 6] Ps Aug[spec 22 et 75] Hier[Zach 10 12 tr hom or iv (791) vii (811)] (Leo Mag[ep ad demetr 12]) Fulg Ferr[ep 7 4] Prim Adrum[Apoc 2]: *scire et intellegere Deum, et facere iudicium et iustitiam in medio terrae* Lucif Cal[athan 1 10]: *int. et sc. in D.* (*dominum*) *gloriari* (3/3) *et iud. et iust. super terram* (2/2) id[athan 2 2].

**et iudicium* Hier Cypr[ib] Lucif Cal (see above) Hier[Zach ib] Ps Aug[spec 75] Zen Ver[ib] Fulg Ferr[ib]: *et iud.* after *iust.* Ir[ib]: (*facere*) *iud. et iust.* Prim Adrum[ib].

**haec enim* PLACENT MIHI Hier: *in his est voluntas mea* Cypr[ib] Lucif Cal[athan 2 2 (2/2)] Ps Aug[spec ib].

N.B. Hil[Ps 51 1] quoting loosely ends with *sed qui gloriatur, in Domino glorietur.*

ix. 25 [26]. *OM *carne* Hier Lucif Cal[ib]: *hab* Hier[Is 52 1 Eph 2 12].

x. 2. **vias* Hier Cypr[test 3 34] Ps Aug[spec 44].

*(*nolite*) *discere* Hier (see critical note): *ambulaveritis* Cypr[ib]: (*nolite*) *incedere* id[ib 3 59]: (*nolite*) *ambulare* Ps Aug[spec ib].

*(*quae timent*) GENTES Hier: (*quia timent*) *illa in personis suis* Cypr[test 3 59]; (*timentes*) *a conspectu facies eorum* Ps Aug[spec ib].

x. 3. *PRAECIDIT Hier: *excisum* Cypr[ib] Ps Aug[spec ib].

**manum* (sic); MANUUM Hier: om Cypr[ib] Ps Aug[spec ib].

x. 3, 4. *IN ASCIA. *Argento et auro* (DECORAVIT ILLUD) Hier: *et conflatum aurum et argentum* Cypr[ib]: *et conf., argento et auro* Ps Aug[ib].

x. 4. *DECORAVIT ILLUD Hier: *speciose conposita sunt* Cypr[ib]: *exornata sunt* Ps Aug[ib].

*CLAVIS ET MALLEIS Hier: *in malleis et in clavis* Cypr[ib]: *et m. et cl.* Ps Aug[ib].

*compegit Hier: om Cypr[ib].

x. 5 [9]. **in similitudinem palmae fabricata sunt, et non loquentur* Hier: quia confixibilia sunt Cypr ib: quia fixa sunt Ps Aug spec ib.

**portata tollentur* (al. *tolluntur* Hier) Hier: *tollentes tollunt illa* Cypr ib.

x. 6—8. *vacat* (*ut* O′) Cypr ib.

x. 9. **de Tharsis affertur, et aurum* Hier: *a Tharsis. venit aurum* Cypr ib (who adds Moab for **de Opaz*, Μωφάζ).

**et manus aerarii* Hier: om Cypr ib.

x. 11. **eis*: om Cypr ib.

**de terra et de his quae sub caelis* (*caelo* Hier Aug) *sunt* Hier Aug Ps 47 15: *de t. et de sub caelo* id Ps 98 1 2/2: *a terra et de sub caelo* id con faust 18 7: *de t.* quae est *sub caelo* Ir c haer 3 6 3: *a t. et de sub caelo isto* Cypr ib Ambr hex 1 3 9: *de sub c.* Fulg Rusp ep 12 8.

x. 12. *OM *Dominus* Hier id tr hom or v (792) but *hab* ib (793): *hab* Ambr ib Ps Aug spec 54 et 56 et 132.

**praeparat orbem in sapientia sua* Hier: *et correxit in sap. sua or.* Ambr ib: *erexit orbem in sap. s.* Hier tr hom or v (793): om Ps Aug 54 et 56 et 132.

N.B. The Spec. is clearly quoting this passage and not, as Weihrich *ad loc.*, li. [xxviii.] 15, 16.

x. 13. *AD VOCEM SUAM Hier: om Ambr ib Ps Aug spec ib.

x. 14. **stultus factus est omnis homo ab scientia sua* Hier: *infatuatus est homo a sci. sua* Ambr ib.

x. 20. **tabernaculum* MEUM Hier: *t. tuum* Ps Aug spec 46 et 140.

*VASTATUM EST Hier (al. *destitutum est*): *miserum factum est, periit* Ps Aug spec ib.

**funiculi* MEI Hier, who adds *sive...pelles* MEAE: *pelles eius* Ps Aug spec ib.

x. 23. **nec viri est ut ambulet et dirigat gressus suos* Hier id[adv pel 1 39] Joh Cass[coll (iii) de trib abren 13]: *neque vir ibit et corriget cogitationem suam* Lucif Cal[athan 2 2]: (*non est in hom. via eius*) *et a Domino gressus hominis diriguntur* Hier[ep 71 7]: *neque vir ibit et corriget v. s.* Aug[Ps 118 12]: (*non est in homine via eius*) *nec viri est ut ambulet et dirigat gressus suos* id[de pecc mer 2 7 et 26]: *nec viri est ut dirigat iter suum* Prosp Aqu[de voc 1 8 et 24]: *neque viri est ut corrigat viam suam* Fulg Rusp[ep 17 41].

x. 24. **corripe* ME Hier Aug[de pecc mer 2 26] Fulg Rusp[ad mon 1 28]: *doce nos* Lucif Cal[ib]: *corripe nos* Ambr[Ps 118 ט 10] Hier[Is 5 25 Ezek 13 9 Zach 1 2] Joh Cass[coll (vi) de nece san 11 3]: *emenda nos*[anon tract adv novat].

**in furore* TUO Hier id[Zach 1 2] Aug[ib] Joh Cass[ib] Fulg Rusp[ib]: *in ira* Lucif Cal[ib]: *in furore* Ambr[ib] Hier[Is 5 25 Ezek 13 8].

**ad nihilum redigas* ME Hier: *ne paucos facias nos* Lucif Cal[ib]: *ut nequaquam p. nos f.* Hier[Ezek 13 8].

x. 25. *provincias Hier, who adds *sive generationes*: regna Lucif Cal[ib] Hier[Ezek 9 8 et 13 8].

*ET DEVORAVERUNT EUM: om Hier Lucif Cal[ib].

xi. 14. **in tempore* 2° Hier Tert[de pud 2] Cypr[de laps 19 ad fort 4]: om Gildas[49].

xi. 15. *MULTA Hier Gildas[81]. See critical note for Ir[c haer 4 17 3].

xi. 16. *FRUCTIFERAM Hier id[Is 17 8 Bened pag 28] Gildas[ib].

xi. 19. *CONSILIA Hier: *cogitatum* Tert[marc 4 40] Cypr[test 2 15] Jul Firm Mat[de err prof rel 27]: *cogitationem* Lact[div inst 4 18]: *consilium* Ambr[de fide 4 165] Hier[tr hom or viii (814 etc)]: *cogitationem malam* Fulg Rusp[ad tras 1 12].

**mittamus* Hier id[tr hom or ib] Commod[carm apol 274] Tert

marc 8 19 (al. *coniiciamus* or *iniic.*) Cypr test 2 15 et 20 Lact ib Jul Firm Mat de err prof rel 27 Eucher form spir int 4 Fulg Rusp ib: *coniiciamus* Tert ib 4 40: *immittamus* (al. *mittamus*) id adv iud 10: *iniiciamus* Ambr Ps 35 1 de fide 4 165 Ruf Aqu in symb apos 22.

**in panem eius* Hier id tr hom or ib Tert marc 8 19 4 40 adv iud 10 Cypr test 2 15 et 20 Lact ib Jul Firm Mat ib Ambr Ps 35 1 de fide 4 165 Ruf Aqu ib Eucher form spir int 7 Fulg Rusp ib: *in pane eius* Commod ib Eucher ib.

xii. 3. *SANCTIFICA EOS IN DIE OCCISIONIS Hier: S. EOS IN D. INTERFECTIONIS *eorum* id Soph 1 7 tr hom or viii (818).

xii. 9. *AVIS DISCOLOR Hier: *spelunca hyaenae* id Is 65 5 tr hom or viii (820).

xii. 13. **hereditatem acceperunt* Hier: *cleri eorum* Hier ep 51 1, 52 5 Os 5 7 Am 8 4. Comp. *cleri eorum non proderant eis* id tr hom or vii (809 *bis*).

*a* FRUCTIBUS *vestris* Hier, who adds (to *a fr.*) *sive a glorificatione vestra*: *a gloria v.* W: *a gloriatione v.* Hier tr hom or vii (810 etc *quinquies*): *a glorific. v.* Ps Sulp Sev ep ad sor 16.

**propter* IRAM FURORIS Hier, who adds *sive ab opprobrio in conspectu* id ib (810): *et in properia* (*sic*) *ante Dm* W: *ab opprob. in consp.* Ps Sulp Sev ib.

xii. 14. **vicinos* MEOS Hier: *vic.* W.

xiii. 1. *INFERES ILLUD Hier: *transi*bis W; Hier tr hom or vii (811).

xiii. 7. *ABSCONDERAM *illud*: *defoderam* W.

xiii. 9, 10. *MULTAM. POPULUM (*et* POP. Hier) ISTUM Hier: (*sic dispergam contumeliam Hierusalem*) *multam istam* W.

xiii. 10. *PESSIMUM Hier: om W.

*ET AMBULANT IN PRAVITATE CORDIS SUI Hier, who adds *sive in directione c. s.*: om W.

xiii. 11. *OMNEM _domum Israel et omnem domum Iuda_ Hier: _d. Istr._ (_Isr._) _et o. d. I._ W; Hier [tr hom or vii (811)].

xiii. 20. *_oculos_ VESTROS Hier id [Mal 2 3].

xiv. 7. *TIBI (_peccavimus_) Hier Aug [quaest in hept 5 55].

xiv. 9. *VAGUS Hier: _dormiens_ Vigil Taps [de Trin 8 Bened pag 223].

xiv. 14. *_et_ SEDUCTIONEM Hier Mar Vict Afer [ep athan etc] Gildas [81]: _et praesumptiones_ Ps Aug [spec 49].

xiv. 15. *IN (om IN Hier) GLADIO _et fame consumentur_ Hier Gildas [ib]: _morientur et in fame consummabuntur_ W.

xiv. 16. *ERUNT Hier Gildas [ib]: _et erint_ W.

xiv. 17. *_virgo filia populi mei_: _f. plebis meae_ W.

xiv. 18. *PROPHETA QUOQUE _et_ SACERDOS Hier: _sacerdotes et profetae_ W.

xiv. 19. *ABOMINATA EST Hier: (_a Sion_) _recessit_ W.

xiv. 21. *NEQUE FACIAS NOBIS CONTUMELIAM (_solii_) Hier: _ne perdas_ W.

xv. 6. *_laboravi_ rogans Hier: _etiam non parcam_ W; _et ultra non sinam te_ Hier [tr hom or x (835)].

xv. 7. *TERRAE Hier, who adds _sive populi mei_: _plebis meae_ W.

*A VIIS SUIS NON SUNT REVERSI Hier Joh Cass [coll (vi) de nece san 11]: _propter malignitates eorum_ W.

xv. 10. *_non_ FOENERAVI, _nec_ FOENERA_vit_ (FEN. Hier) Hier: _non profui, neque profuit_ W; Ambr [de exc frat 2 34] Hier [ep 96 4 tr hom or i (747) xi (841 etc)]. Comp. οὐκ ὠφέλησα, οὐδὲ ὠφέλησάν με Philo [de confus ling § 12 i 411].

*OMNES Hier: _virtus mea defecit_ W; Ambr [ib] Hier [tr hom or xi (846 etc _ter_)]. Comp. ἡ ἰσχύς μου ἐξέλιπεν Philo [ib].

xv. 11. *DICIT Hier: _fiat_ W.

*SI NON RELIQUIAE TUAE Hier: _consummatio illorum_ W.

xv. 13. *(_dabo_) GRATIS Hier, adding _sive absque pretio_

id [tr hom or xi (848)], but without _gr._ [ib (849)]: (_dabo_) _immutationem_ W.

*_in omnibus peccatis tuis_ Hier: _propter omnia peccata tua_ W; Hier [tr hom or xi (849)].

xv. 14. *_et_ ADDUCAM (_inimicos tuos_) Hier, who adds _sive servire te faciam inimicis tuis_: _et dabo te in servitudinem inim. t._ id [tr hom or xi (850)]: _et tradam_ W.

xv. 15. *TU SCIS Hier: _tu cognovisti_ id [ib]: om W; Aug [con litt pet 2 235].

xv. 16. *INVENTI SUNT Hier, who adds _sive ab his qui reprobant_: _a contemnentibus_ id [tr hom or xi (851 _bis_)]: _ab his qui spernunt_ Aug [ib].

*ET COMEDI EOS Hier: _consumma_ (al. _-mavi_) _eos_ id [tr hom or xi (851)]: so, with _illos_ Aug [ib].

xv. 17. *_et_ GLORIATUS SUM Hier, who adds _sive metuebam_: _sed verebar_ W: _sed timebam_ Hier [tr hom or xi (853 _bis_)] Aug [ib].

xv. 18. *DOLOR MEUS Hier, who adds _sive...qui contristant me_: (_ut quid_) _iniurantes me_ W: _qui contristant me_ Cypr [ep 73 6] Aug [de bapt con don 2 20 con litt pet ib].

*_factus est_...PERPETUUS Hier, who adds _sive...confortantur_: _convalescent_ W: _praevalent_ Cypr [ib] Aug [de bapt etc ib con litt pet ib].

*DESPERABILIS Hier, who adds _sive...fortis_: _solida est_ W; Cypr [ib] Aug [de bapt etc ib]: _valida est_ id [con litt pet ib].

N.B. Obs. at end of _v._ *_facta est mihi quasi mendacium aquarum infidelium_ Hier, comp. with _facta est mihi sicut aqua mendax, non habens fidem_ Hier [tr hom or xi (855)]: so, with _facti sunt_ Aug [ep 108 6]. These renderings are much closer to O′ than is Vulg.

xvi. 2. *(OM _et_) _non accipies uxorem_: _noli accipere ux._ Hier: _et tu ne accipias ux._ id [ep 22 21].

xvi. 18. *PRIMUM DUPLICES Hier id [tr hom or xii (860 etc)]: DUPLICITER W (but see crit. note).

*IMPLEVERUNT Hier id [ib]: REPLEV. W.

xvi. 19. **vere mendacium* Hier: *quoniam falsa* Hier [tr hom or ib (863 *bis*)]: *quam f.* Aug [con faust man 18 7] Ps Aug [spec 44].

xvii. 1. *SUPER ALTITUDINEM (al. LATIT. Hier) CORDIS EORUM Hier, who adds *sive in pectore c. e.*: (SCRIPTA EST, JUDA, CULPA TUA GRAPHIO FERREO ET UNGUE ADAMANTINO, ET SCRIPTA EST) IN PECTORE ET IN CORDE TUO Ambr [de spir san 3 14]: *in p. cordis tui* id [apol dav alt 62]: *super pectus cordis eorum* Hier [tr hom or ib (864)].

xvii. 1—4. om W.

xvii. 5. *ET PONIT CARNEM BRACHIUM SUUM Hier Eugip [vita sev 5 2]: *et confirmavit c. brachii sui* W; Ps Aug [spec 107]: *et firmat c. b. s.* Aug [con faust man 18 8 de grat et lib arb 6] (Leo Mag [ep ad dem 8]): *et firmavit c. brachii sui* Hier [Is 31 1]: *et firmat c. b. s.* Prosp Aqu [lib con coll 16 [36] 1] Eugip [exc Aug 283]: *et p. spem carnem b. s.* Cassiod [Ps 30 13, 107 8]: so with *c. sp.* id [ib 88 13] om id [Ps 59 11].

xvii. 8. **timebit*: *erit sollicitum* Hier, who adds *sive …timebit*; W; Aug [con faust man ib] Fulg Ferr [ep 7 4].

xvii. 9. *PRAVUM Hier id [Am 4 13 adv pel 1 39]: *grave* W; Aug [con faust man ib de civ Dei xviii 33 1].

**et* INSCRUTABILE (*quis cognoscet illud?*) Hier id [Am 4 13]: *et homo* W; Ir [c haer 3 18 3] Tert [marc 3 7 de car chr 15] Cypr [test 2 10] Lact [div inst 4 13 inst epit 39 (44)] Hil [Trin 4 42] Ambr [Ps 39 5, 43 20, 61 2, 118 ל 3 de inst virg 99 de poenit 1 12] Zen Ver [2 7 3] Hier [eccles Bened pag 417 Is 17 11 Ben pag 282] Aug [con faust man ib 3/3 de civ Dei ib] Vigil Taps [con eut 1 13] Eugip [exc Aug 50] Commod [carm apol 370]: *homo* Ir [c haer 3 19 1, 4 33 11] Tert [adv iud 14] (al. *et h.*) Vigil Taps [trin 3 Bened pag 222].

xvii. 11. *PERDIX Hier id [tr hom or iv (780 etc) 4/4]: *clam-*

*avit perdix* Sang; Ambr hex 6 13 ep 1 32 1 Hier ep 132 4 Aug con faust man 18 12 Philast praef in lib de haer Eucher lib form spir int 5: [*p. qui c.* Ambr ep 1 46 14].

xvii. 12. *(*solium gloriae*) *altitudinis* Hier: (*thronus virtutis*) *exaltatus est* Ambr Luc lib 6 § 60 *thr. gl. exaltatus* (AB INITIO LOCUS) Hier tr hom or iv (781 etc.) 3/3: (*sedes autem g.*) *ex. est* (*sanctificatio nostra*) Aug con faust man 18 13: om Sang.

Thus Sang Ambr Aug omit 'מכ' מק.

xvii. 13. **recedentes in terra scribentur* (al. *describantur* Hier) Hier: *qui discesserunt* a terra *scribentur in* libro mortis Sang: *derelinquentes* te *super terram scribentur* Hier ep 129 1: *relinquentes autem* te *in terra scrib.* id adv pel 2 17: *recedentes super terram scribantur* Aug con adv leg 1 44: so with *deced.* Hier tr hom or iv (787) and, with *disced.* (790 *bis*): *discedentes* a terra evertantur Ps Aug spec 144: *recedentes* (al. *rec.* a te) *in t. scribantur* Joh Cass coll (xvii) de defin 25 19: *rec.* a te *in t. scribentur* Prim Adrum in Apoc 4 (Migne, p 880).

*(*venam*) AQUARUM VIVENTIUM Hier, who adds (to *venam*) *sive fontem* Salv de gub 4 1: [*fon*]*tem vitae* Sang Hier tr hom or ib (788, 791) Ps Aug spec ib Vigil Taps de trin 12 Bened pag 325.

xvii. 16. *(*et*) *ego* (*ego autem* for *et ego* Hier) *non sum turbatus, te pastorem sequens* Hier, who adds *non laboravi sequens te*: *ego autem non* [*labo*]*ravi subsequens* [*te*] Sang: *non l. sequens post te* Ambr de virginit 102 ep 2 85 2: *non l. sequens te* Hier ep 130 7 Ezek 13 3: *ego autem non l. subsequens te* Aug de cons evang 8 16: so, inserting *post* Hier tr hom or iv (781, 791, 792) *ego autem non l. te sequens* Joh Cass de coen inst 1 10.

*(*et*) *diem hominis non desideravi* Hier: [*et diem*] *h.*

*non de*[*sideravi*] Sang: (*et*) *d. h. non concupivi* Hil [Ps 51 3] Ambr [de virginit ib] Hier [ib] Aug [de cons evang ib Ps 36 33, 67 14, 140 9]: *et d. homin*um *non c.* id [Ps 137 8].

xvii. 20. *AUDITE Hier Tycon [5 (p 62)].

xvii. 21. **nec* INFERATIS PER Hier: *et nolite exire* Tycon [ib].

xvii. 23. *OM *super patres suos* Hier: *hab* Tycon [ib].

xvii. 24. **si audieritis* (*me*) Hier: *si* (*me*) *aud.* (al. *quaesieritis*) Tycon [ib].

xvii. 25. **et principes* Hier Tycon [ib].

xvii. 26. **et victimam* (*-mas* Hier, who adds *sive thymiamata*) *et sacrificium* (Hier adds *sive manua*) Hier: ET INCENSA *et manna* (thus reducing the conflate to a single reading) Tycon [ib].

xvii. 27. *DOMOS Hier: *itinera* Tycon [ib 2/2].

xviii. 2. **audies* Hier Hil [Ps 2 § 39] Ambr [de int iob et dav 2 20] Vigil Taps [con eut 4 20] (Vict Tun [de poenit ap ambr 27]).

xviii. 4. **e luto manibus suis* Hier: *in m. eius* Hil [Ps 2 § 39] Vigil Taps [ib]: *in m. s.* Ambr [ib] Hier [Is 45 9] (Vict Tun [ib]). The presence in the Vulg of *e luto* shews (see crit. note) that St Jerome's reading of the two following words was identical with our own. It is thus interesting to see how he was led, apparently by considerations of smoothness, to retain contrary to his wont the text which was in possession, although it was at variance with the form which the Heb. had already assumed in his day. Comp. xxii. 12.

xviii. 7. *(*ut eradicem*) ET DESTRUAM (*et disperdam*) Hier id [ep 122 3 adv pel 3 6]: *ut feriam eos* (*et perdam*) Hil [ib]: *ut tollam eos* (*et ut perdam eos*) Vict Tun [ib]: (*ut*) *auferam eam* (*et disperdam*) Hier [Am 9 10]: (*eradicavit*) DESTRUXIT (*et perdidit*) id [Ab 3 9]: *et auferam* (*et disp. eos*) id [Soph 2 12]:

(*ut evellam*) ET DESTRUAM (*et disp.*) Joh Cass coll (xvii) de defin 25: (*ut evellam*) ET DESTR. (*et eradicem*) Faust Rheg de grat Dei 2 10: (*ut evellam et dissipem*) ET DESTRUAM (*et disp.*) Gildas 36.

xviii. 8. *QUOD LOCUTUS SUM ADVERSUS (-SUM Hier) EAM Hier: om Hil ib Faust Rheg ib Vict Tun ib Hier Am 9 10 (comp. his very loose quot. Soph ii 12) Aug ser 22 6: *quod l. s. ut facerem ei* Hier adv pel 2 6 ep 122 3 Joh Cass ib Gildas ib.

xviii. 12. *DESPERAVIMUS Hier, who adds *sive confortabimur* id ep 122 3: DESPERAMUS Gildas 50.

*COGITATIONES...*nostras* Hier id ib Gildas ib.

**pravitatem* Hier, who adds, *sive quod placuit* id ib Gildas ib.

xviii. 14. **de petra* AGRI Hier, who adds as the rendering of O′ *Numquid deficient de p. ubera* (*aut nix de Lebano, aut declinabit aqua violenter sublata vento*)? Gildas ib: *de p. ubera* Ambr Ps 118 D 31 de virginibus 1 22.

**aquae erumpentes* FRIGIDAE *et* (om *et* Gildas) *deluentes* Hier Gildas ib: *aqua quae fertur valido vento* Ambr Ps ib: *val. ven. quae portatur* id de virg ib.

xviii. 15. *et impingentes Hier, who adds *sive impingentes*: et inp. Joh Cass coll (xxiv) de mortif 24.

xviii. 17. *DORSUM ET NON FACIEM *ostendam eis* IN *die perditionis eorum* Hier: *ost. eis diem perd. eor.* W.

xviii. 18. **et* NON *attendamus* Hier: *et audiemus* W.

xviii. 19. **vocem* ADVERSARIORUM *meorum* Hier: *v. iustitiae meae* W.

xviii. 20. *FODERUNT FOVEAM Hier: *locuti sunt verbum* W.

xviii. 21. **et* DEDUC *eos* Hier: *et* confringa (*sic*) *illos* W.

xviii. 23. *FIANT CORRUENTES Hier: *fiat infirmitas eorum* W.

xix. 2. *VALLEM Hier Eucher lib form spir int 4: *multitudinem virorum* W.

**filii* ENNOM Hier: *filios filiorum meorum* W: *filiorum* ENNON Eucher ib.

xix. 3. *OM κ. ἀν. Ἰούδα Hier W.

*OM καὶ οἱ εἰσπ...ταύταις Hier W.

xix. 4. *ET *repleverunt*: *replerunt* W.

xix. 5. *IN HOLOCAUSTUM BAHALI (BAALIM Hier) Hier: om W.

**nec* ASCENDERUNT *in cor meum* Hier: *neque cogitavi in corde meo* W.

xix. 7. **et* DISSIPABO Hier: *et interficiam* W.

xix. 8. **et* PONAM Hier: *et statuam* W.

**obstupescet* Hier: *contristabitur* W.

xix. 9. **et* CIBABO EOS Hier: *et edent* W.

*ET QUI QUAERUNT ANIMAS EORUM: om W.

xix. 11. *ET IN THOFETH...AD SEPELIENDUM Hier: om W.

xix. 12. **ut* (ET Hier) *ponam* Hier: *ut detur* W.

xix. 13. *IMMUNDAE Hier: *immunditiarum* W.

**et libaverunt libamina* Hier: *et* immolarunt hostias W.

xx. 2. **et percussit* PHASSUR (PHASUR Hier) IER. PROPHETANTEM (PROPHETAM IER. Hier) Hier: *et p. eum* W.

*BENIAMIN Hier: *domus abiecta* (*sic*) W.

xx. 3. *CUMQUE ILLUXISSET IN CRASTINUM Hier: om W.

*PAVOREM UNDIQUE Hier: *translationem* W.

xx. 4. **in* PAVOREM Hier: *in translationem* W.

**et* OMNEM IUDAM Hier: *et te et om. Iu.* W.

xx. 6. *VENIENS (-NIES Hier) *et ibi* Hier : om W.

xx. 7. *OMNES Hier : *consummavi* W : *exegi* Hier[ep 18 15] : *complevi* id[tr hom or xi (851)].

xx. 9. *IN CORDE MEO Hier Ambr[Ps 118 כ 4 et נ 26 off min 8 102] : om Hier[tr hom or xi (841)].

*(*ignis exaestuans*) CLAUSUS(*que*) Hier: (*i. ardens*) *flammigerans* W : (*i. ard.*) *flammans* Ambr[Ps 118 כ 4 et נ 26] : so, with *flammigerans* id[Luc lib vii § 132 off min ib] : (*i.*) *flammig.* id[Ps 38 4, 118 צ 19 ep 1 43 15] : (*i.*) *inflammans* id[de is et an 77] : *i. ard.* Hier[tr hom or ib].

*(*et defeci*) FERRE Hier, who adds (to *defeci*) *sive dissolutus sum* ; *undique* W ; Ambr[de is et an ib ep ib Ps 118 כ 4 et נ 26 off min ib] Hier[tr hom or ib].

*non sustinens* Hier : *et non possum ferre* W : *et f. non p.* Ambr[de is et an ib ep ib Ps 118 ib off min ib] Hier[tr hom or ib].

xx. 10. ET TERROREM Hier : *tumultuantium* W.

*PERSEQUIMINI *et* PERSEQUAMUR *eum* Hier : *adstate et superstemus ei* W.

xx. 16. *OM ἐν θυμῷ Hier id[adv pel 2 27].

xx. 17. *A *vulva* Hier : *in v.* matris W : *in v.* Hier[adv pel ib].

xx. 18. **quare* (ἵνα τί τοῦτο) Hier id[adv pel ib] : *ut quid ergo* W.

xxi. 2. *NABUCHODONOSOR Hier : om W.

xxi. 3. *OM *βασ.* 'I. Hier W.

xxi. 4. *DEUS ISRAEL Hier : om W.

*ADVERSUM REGEM BAB. ET Hier : om W.

*ET CONGREGABO EA (EOS Hier) Hier : om W.

xxi. 5. **forti* Hier : *valido* W.

xxi. 6. *ET BESTIAE : *et pecora* W.

xxi. 7. **qui* (*derelicti sunt*) Hier : *quae etc.* W.

*IN MANU N. REGIS BAB. ET Hier : om W.

*ET IN MANU 2° Hier: om W.

*et PERCUTIET eos Hier: *et contrucidabunt eos* W.

*non MOVEBITUR (FLECTETUR Hier) Hier: *non parcam* W.

xxi. 9. *ET PESTE Hier: om W.

**vivet* Hier W.

*QUASI SPOLIUM Hier: in utilitate *et vivet* W.

xxi. 10. *AIT DOMINUS Hier: om W.

xxi. 12. **et* ERUITE W: *et recte agite et liberate* Ps Aug spec 10.

*(*ne forte*) EGREDIATUR Hier, who adds *sive ut non egred.*: *succendatur* W; Ps Aug spec ib.

*PROPTER MALITIAM STUDIORUM VESTRORUM Hier: om W; Ps Aug ib.

xxi. 13. *solidae Hier: (*qui inhabitas*) *Sor* (*in campestri*) W.

**percutiet* Hier, who adds *sive terrebit*: *pavorem... incutiet* W.

xxi. 14. ET VISITABO...DOMINUS Hier: om W.

xxii. 1. *DESCENDE Hier: *vade et des.* W.

xxii. 2. **et* SERVI TUI Hier: *et* PUERI W.

xxii. 4. **ipsi et* Hier: IPSE et W.

xxii. 5. *AUDIERITIS Hier Gildas 50: *fueritis* W.

xxii. 6. **inhabitabiles* Hier: *quae non inhabitantur* W.

xxii. 7. **et* SANCTIFICABO Hier, who adds (*aedificabo*): *et* SANCIAM W.

xxii. 10. **mortuum* Hier: *defunctum* W.

xxii. 12. **transtuli* Hier: *transmigravi* W.

xxii. 13. *VAE Hier: o W; Ambr ep 1 30 4 Ps Aug spec 118.

xxii. 14. *QUI DICIT AEDIFICABO Hier: *aedificasti* W; Ambr ib 1 30 5.

xxii. 15. *CONFERS TE Hier: *tu exacerbatus es* W.

*CEDRO Hier: *in acham* W.

xxii. 15, 16. **iustitiam* TUNC CUM BENE ERAT EI? (16) IUDICAVIT Hier: *iust. bonam nescierunt. non iudicasti* W.

xxii. 17. *TUI VERO OCULI ET COR (*ad avaritiam*) Hier: *non sunt oc. tui neque tuum cor bonum* W: so, with *cor tuum*, Ir[c haer 4 18 3].

*CURSUM Hier: *homicidium* W; Ir[ib].

xxii. 18. **ad Ioachim* (*-cim* Hier) *filium Iosiae regem Iuda* Hier: *ad istum virum* W.

*(*frater*) ET VAE frater (SOROR Hier) Hier: om W.

*ET VAE INCLYTE Hier: om W.

xxii. 20. *ad TRANSEUNTES: *trans mare* W.

xxii. 21. **in* ABUNDANTIA *tua* Hier: *in lapsu tuo* W.

xxii. 22. **pastores tuos* Hier, who adds *sive amatores t.* W (רֹעַיִךְ).

*MALITIA TUA (רָעָתֵךְ) Hier: *amatoribus tuis* W.

xxii. 23. **congemuisti* Hier: *congemisces in eo* W.

xxii. 24. **fuerit* Hier Gildas[50]: *effectus fuerit ut fiat* W: *factus fuerit* Ir[c haer 8 21 9].

xxii. 25. *ET IN MANU 1° Hier: om W.

*ET IN MANU N. REGIS BAB. ET Hier: om W.

xxii. 26. **in terram* ALIENAM Hier: *in eam t.* W.

xxii. 27. *UT REVERTANTUR ILLUC Hier: om W.

xxii. 28. *NUMQUID VAS FICTILE ATQUE CONTRITUM VIR ISTE *Ieconias* (al. *Chonias* Hier) Hier: *depretiatus est Ieremias* (*sic*) W: *inhonoratus est Iech.* Ir[c haer 8 21 9] Hier[Os 8 8 tr hom or iii (777)]: *depretiatus est Iech.* Ambr[de int iob et dav 2 20]: *abiectus est Iech.* id[Luc lib 8 § 40].

*QUARE Hier: *propter quod* W; Ambr[Luc ib]: *quoniam* Ir[ib].

xxii. 29. **terra terra* (TERRA again Hier) Hier W; Ambr [Luc ib ep 1 25 4] Hier [Is 26 19 tr hom or Ezek 4]: *terra* Ir [ib] Ambr [de int iob etc ib].

xxii. 30. *HAEC DICIT DOMINUS Hier: om W; Ir [ib] Ambr [Luc ib de int iob etc ib].

*(*scribe virum istum*) STERILEM Hier: (*s. v. i.*) *reprobatum hominem* W: (*s. v. hunc*) *abdicatum hom.* Ir [ib]: (*v. i.*) *abdicatum* Ambr [Luc ib de int iob etc ib].

*IN DIEBUS SUIS NON PROSPERABITUR Hier: om W; Ir [ib] Ambr [Luc ib].

xxiii. 1. *(*gregem*) *pascuae* MEAE Hier Gildas [82]: (*oves*) *a pastionibus suis* W: *oves* MEAS (but rest of *v.* very loosely quoted) Ps Aug [spec 46].

xxiii. 2. *QUI PASCUNT Hier Gildas [ib]: (*ad eos*) *qui pastores sunt* (*plebis suae*) W: QUI REGUNT Ps Aug [spec ib].

xxiii. 3. *GREGIS *mei* Hier: *plebis meae* W.

*DE *omnibus* (*terris*) Hier: AB *omni* (*terra*) W.

xxiii. 4. *ET NULLUS QUERETUR (QUAER. Hier) EX NUMERO Hier: om W; Ps Aug [spec 46].

xxiii. 6. **et Israel* Hier W (*et Istrahel*); Hil [Ps 131 § 1] Aug [de civ Dei 18 33 1].

**quod vocabunt* (Hier adds *sive vocabit*) *eum*, *Dominus* iustus *noster* Hier Aug [ib]: *q. v. eum Dom. Iosedec* W.

xxiii. 7, 8. om W. N.B. After *v.* 39 W is lacking.

xxiii. 9. *EBRIUS Hier: *contritus* W.

**a facie* VERBORUM SANCTORUM *eius* Hier, who adds *sive et facie decoris gloriae eius*: *a specie honore eius* W.

xxiii. 10. *QUIA ADULTERIIS (al. ADULTERIS Hier) REPLETA EST TERRA Hier: om W.

*MALEDICTIONIS Hier, who adds *sive iuramenti*: *istorum* W.

*CURSUS *eorum* Hier W.

*DISSIMILIS Hier: NON SIC W.

xxiii. 14. **manus* PESSIMORUM Hier: *manibus* MALIGNIS W.

xxiii. 16. *QUI PROPHETANT VOBIS Hier Gildas[ib]: om W; Cypr[de cath eccl un 11 ep 43 5] Ps Aug[spec 50].

xxiii. 17. **dicunt* Hier W Cypr[ib] Ps Aug[spec ib] Gildas[ib].

**his qui* BLASPHEMANT AD (om AD Hier: *qui* ME BL. Gildas) ME Hier Gildas[ib]: LOCUTUS EST DOMINUS Hier, who adds (to *bl. me*) *sivi abiiciunt verbum meum*: *eis qui abigunt v. Domini* W: *eis qui abiciunt v. Dei* Cypr[de cath etc ib]: so with *Dom.*[ep ib]: *his qui repellunt v. Dom.* Ps Aug[spec ib].

**et omni* QUI AMBULAT (*et omnibus qui ambulant* Gildas) IN PRAVITATE CORDIS SUI Hier Gildas[ib]: *et omnibus ingredientibus in voluntatibus suis, omni eunti in errore cordis sui* W: *et omn. ambulantibus in vol. suis* Cypr[de cath eccl un 11].

xxiii. 18. **in* CONSILIO *Domini* Hier Gildas[ib]: *in substantia Dom.* W (so *subs.* for *consilio* in *v.* 22); Mar Vict Afer[adv ar 1 30, 2 3] Ambr[de fide 3 122] Ps Aug[spec 104] Foegad[de fil div 4] Vigil Taps[de trin 5 Bened pag 248 con varim 1 44 con pall ar 2 4] Vict Vit[de pers 3 2]: *in s.* mea Mar Vict Afer[adv ar 1 59] Vigil Taps[con ar sab etc 2 19].

**et vidit* ET AUDIVit (*sermonem eius*) Hier Gildas[ib]: so with *verbum eius* Vict Vit[ib]: *et v. verbum eius* W Mar Vict Afer[adv ar 1 30, 2 3]: *et v. verbum* meum[ib 1 59]: *et audissent v.* m. Vigil Taps[con ar sab ib]: *et videbit verbum* Domini Foegad[ib] Vigil Taps[con pall ar ib]: *et vidit v. eius* Ps Aug[spec ib]: *et videbit verbum* Dei Vigil Taps[con varim ib]: *et v. v. eius* id[de trin ib].

xxiii. 20. **intell*IGITIS (-GETIS Hier Gildas) CON-

SILIUM EIUS Hier Gildas [ib]: *intelligent ea* W; Ir [c haer 4 26 1]: *cognoscetis ea* Cypr [test 1 4].

xxiii. 22. *A VIA SUA MALA ET Hier Vict Vit [de pers 3 2]: om W; Cypr [de cath eccl un 11] Ambr [de fide 3 22] Ps Aug [spec 104] Vigil Taps [con ar sab 2 19 de trin 5 Bened pag 248 con varim 1 44 con pall ar 2 4] Prim Adrum [in Apoc 2 (Migne p 822)].

xxiii. 23. *(*Putasne*) *Deus* (*Numquid D.* Hier) *e vicino ego sum, dicit Dominus* (om *d. D.* Ir)? *et non Deus de longe?* Hier: *Deus adpropinquans* (*approp.* Ir Cassiod) *ego sum, d. Dom.* (om *d. D.* Ir), *et non Deus a* (Ir Ps Aug *de* for *a*) *longinquo* W; Ir [c haer 4 19 2] Ps Aug [spec 8] Cassiod [Ps 138 9]: *ego D. adproximans et non D. de longinquo* Cypr [test 3 56 de laps 27 de dom or 4] Fulg Rusp [ad tras 2 16] (id [ser 16]): so with *proximans* Fulg Rusp [ib 2 7]: so with *sum D. approx.* id [ep 14 5]: *ego sum D. approx. et* eorum (*sic*; *sed lege, et non*) *D. de longinquo* id [con ser fest 1 5]: *D. appropians ego sum et non D. de longe, d. D.* Hil [Ps 118 8]: *ego sum D. approp. et non de longe* id [Ps 129 2]: *D. appropinquans ego sum* Ambr [Ps 118 ף 36]: *Deus appropinquans ego et non de longe, d. D.* Hier [Is 29 14]: *ego D. approp. et non de longe* id [ib 55 7]: *ego D. approp. et non de longe Deus, d. D.* [ib 66 19]: *ego D. approp. et non D. de longe, d. D.* id [Ezek 23 36]: *D. appr. ego et non D. de longe* id [Mic 2 10]: *ego Dom. appr. et non de longe* id [Soph 3 1]: *ego Deus appr. et non de longinquo, d. D.* id [Mat 21 33]: *ego D. appr. et non de longe* id [Eph 2 14]: *D. approp. ego et non procul* id [adv pel 2 27]: *ego D. approx. et non de longinquo* Vict Vit [de pers 3 15].

xxiii. 26. *SEDUCTIONES Hier, who adds *sive voluntates cordis sui*: *voluntates* W.

xxiii. 27. *POPULUS MEUS Hier: om W.

*NOMINIS MEI Hier: *legis* suae W.

xxiii. 28. *DICIT DOMINUS Hier id [adv pel 1 13 Is 30 25]

Am 9 9 Zach 4 8 Eucher lib form spir int 4: *sic etiam verba mea, d. D.* W.

xxiii. 29. **Numquid non* Hier: NONNE W; Cassiod Ps 17 32.

xxiii. 31. *QUI ASSUMUNT LINGUAS SUAS Hier: QUI ACCIPIUNT sibi linguis W.

*ET AIUNT: DICIT (DOMINUS) Hier: *et dormitant somniantes* W.

xxiii. 32. **ad prophetas* (OM *qui prophetant*) *somniantes mendacium* Hier: *ad prof. qui profetant somnia falsa* W.

**qui* NARRAVERUNT (al. NARRANT Hier) *ea* Hier: *et* ENARRANT *ea* W.

xxiii. 33. **vel* PROPHETA *aut* SACERDOS Hier: *aut sac. aut* profetes W.

*UT QUID VOBIS *onus*: *vos estis onus* adding *sive assumptio* Hier: *vos estis* dictio W.

xxiii. 36. *(*non*) MEMORABITUR Hier: (*nolite*) *nominare* W.

*ET PERVERTITIS (al. PERVERTISTI Hier)...DEI NOSTRI Hier: om W.

xxiii. 37. *HAEC DICES...DOMINUS 1°: *haec dices*, adding *sive dicetis* (al. *dicitis*)...DOM. Hier: om W.

xxiii. 38. *SI AUTEM...DIXERITIS Hier: om W.

xxiv. 5. *TRANSMIGRATIONEM IUDA Hier: *translatos I.* Ambr hex 8 59.

xxiv. 6. *OM εἰς ἀγαθά 2° Hier Auct qu ex utr test 102: *in bona* Ambr hex 8 59 Prosp Aqu de voc om gent 1 24.

xxiv. 8. **om* כִּי Hier (Cypr de pasch comp 11).

xxiv. 9. *AFFLICTIONEMQUE Hier: (om Cypr ib).

**in* PROVERBIUM Hier: (*in odium* Cypr ib).

*ET PATRIBUS EORUM Hier: (om Cypr ib).

xxv. 4. **et* MISIT DOMINUS Hier: *misi* Cypr test 1 2

Lact [div inst 4 11]. N.B. Sabatier's citation of Cassiod. should read Ps 126. See my note on vii. 13, 25.

*OMNES *servos* SUOS Hier: *servos meos* Cypr [ib] Lact [ib].

xxv. 5. **cum diceret* (*-rem* Hier) Hier: *dicens* Cypr [ib] Cassiod [Ps 126 3], but see on vii. 13, 25: *cum dicerem* vobis Lact [ib].

**ded*IT DOMINUS Hier: *dedi* Cypr [ib] Lact [ib].

xxv. 6. **me* Hier Cypr [ib et ad fort 3 (de aleat 8)] Lact [ib] Iul Firm Mat [de err prof rel 28] Zen Ver [1 15 2].

*ET NON AFFLIGAM *vos* Hier: *ad disperdendos vos* Cypr [ib] Lact [ib] Iul Firm Mat [ib]: et disperdam *vos* Zen Ver [ib].

xxv. 9. **mittam*...AD (om AD Hier) N....SERVUM MEUM Hier: [vocavi N. s. m. Hier [Soph 1 7]].

xxv. 15. *(*vini*) FURORIS Hier, who adds *sive meri*: (*v.*) *meri* Tycon [reg 4 (p 53)] Ambr [Ps 37 2] Hier [ep 18 15 Is 51 17 Ezek 23 28 tr hom or 9 (822)]: om Hier [Is 6 8].

*DE ILLO Hier: om Tycon [ib] Ambr [ib] Hier [ep ib Is 6 8] (but earlier part of *v.* is also very loosely quoted in that passage) [51 17 Ezek ib tr hom or ib].

xxv. 16. *ET BIBENT Hier id [ep ib Is 51 17 Ezek ib tr hom or ib]: om Tycon [ib] Ambr [ib].

**et* TURBABUNTUR (*inebriabuntur* Hier, who adds *sive voment*) *et insanient* Hier: *et voment et ins.* Tycon [ib] Ambr [ib] Hier [ep ib Is ib Ezek ib tr hom or ib].

xxv. 18. *ET IN MALEDICTIONEM, SICUT DIES ISTA Hier: om Tycon [ib] Hier [ep ib].

xxv. 20. *CUNCTIS REGIBUS TERRAE AUSITIDIS Hier: om Tycon [ib].

xxv. 22. *TERRAE INSULARUM Hier: om Tycon [ib].

xxv. 23. **Theman et Buz* Hier: *Theman et Bos*or Tycon [ib].

xxv. 24. *ET CUNCTIS REGIBUS ARA*biae* Hier: om Tycon [ib].

xxv. 25. *ET CUNCTIS REGIBUS ZABRI: ZAMRI Hier: om Tycon [ib].

*MAEDORUM Hier: *Persarum* Tycon [ib].

xxv. 26. *AQUILONIS (al. Babylonis Hier) Hier: *a Subsolano* Tycon [ib].

*TERRAE Hier Tycon [ib].

*ET REX SESACH BIBET POST EOS Hier: om Tycon [ib].

xxv. 29. *QUASI INNOCENTES INMUNES ERITIS? NON ERITIS INMUNES Hier: *purgatione non eritis purgati* Tycon [ib 2/2].

xxv. 38. *(a facie) IRAE columbae Hier, who adds *sive a f. gladii magni*: *a. f. gl. col.* id [Soph 1 7].

xxvi. 2. **ad omnes* CIVITATES *Iuda, de quibus veniunt* Hier: *omni Iudae, iis qui v.* Ambr [de poenit 2 30].

xxvi. 3. **et* POENITEAT ME (*mali*) Hier, who adds *sive quiescam a malo*: *et* POENITEBIT ME Ioh Cass [coll (xvii) de defin 25].

xxx. 8. **de collo* TUO, *et vincula illius* Hier: *a cervice illorum et v. illorum* Cypr [test 1 13]: so, with *eorum* in both places, Hil [Ps 131 1].

**et non* DOMINABUNTUR EI (eis Hier) AMPLIUS ALIENI Hier: *et non operabuntur aliis* Cypr [ib]: *et non op. ipsi* ADHUC *aliis* (al. *aliis* dis) Hil [ib].

xxx. 9. *QUEM Hier: om Cypr [ib] Hil [ib] Cassiod [Ps 131 1].

xxx. 10, 11. Very loosely quoted Hier [adv petr 2 28].

xxxi. 2. **invenit* GRATIAM *in deserto* POPULUS, QUI REMANSERAT *gladio* Hier: quasi *calidum in deserto*, inveni Israel *cum occisis gladio* id [Is 65 8].

xxxi. 8. *INTER QUOS ERUNT COECUS ET CLAUDUS

Hier: *in* die *festo* (adding, *Paschae diem significat*) Tert de bapt 19.

xxxi. 9. *VENIENT Hier, who adds *sive egredientur*: *exierunt* Ambr de int iob et dav 2 7.

*ET IN PRECIBUS: *et in misericordia* Hier: *et in consolatione* Ambr ib.

xxxi. 12. *CONFLUENT Hier: *venient* Ir c haer 5 34 3.

*ET OLEO Hier: *fructuum* Ir ib.

*HORTUS IRRIGUUS Hier, who adds *sive quasi lignum fructiferum*: *lignum fructiferum* Ir ib.

**esurient* Hier Ir ib.

xxxi. 13. *SIMUL Hier: *gaudebunt* Ir ib.

*ET CONSOLABOR EOS Hier: om Ir ib.

xxxi. 14. *ET INEBRIABO Hier: *et magnificabo et inebr.* Ir ib.

*SACERDOTUM Hier, who adds *sive filiorum Levi*: *sac. filiorum Levi* Ir ib.

*PINGUEDINE (דֶּשֶׁן) Hier: om Ir ib.

xxxi. 15. **plorans* (*-rantes* Hier) FILIOS SUOS Hier id Mat 2 17 Bened pag 15 Ambr Ps 37 1 [*R. ploravit f. s.* Ambr ep 44 9].

O.L., like Pesh, (see crit. note) omits עַל בָּנֶי on its second occurrence in M.T. The evidence is as follows:

**super eis*: *super filiis suis* Hier: om Hil Mat 2 7 Ambr Ps 37 1 Eucher hom de bland lugd Vict Cap ev harm int 10.

xxxi. 19. *CONVERTISTI ME Hier: *captivitatis meae* Ambr de poenit 2 36.

**egi poenitentiam* Hier: *poenit. egi* Ambr ib.

*PERCUSSI FEMUR MEUM. CONFUSUS SUM Hier, who adds (after *meum*) *sive ingemui* and (after *conf. s.*) *sive ex die confusionis*: *ingemui super dies confusionis* Ambr ib.

**et* ERUBUI Hier, who adds *et ostendi te*: *et subiectus sum tibi* Ambr ib.

xxxi. 19, 20. **adolescentiae meae.* (20) *Si filius honorabilis mihi Efraim* (*Ephr.* Hier) *si puer delicatus* Hier: a iuventute mea dilectus mihi est *filius Eph.*, *puer in deliciis* Ambr [Luc 1 15 de poenit 2 38].

xxxi. 22. *FEMINA CIRCUMDABIT VIRUM Hier (id de ben Iac patr): *in qua salute circuibant homines* Aug [op imp con Iul 3 84]: *faciam novum in femina, quod omnes mirabimini* (very loosely) Rust diac [con aceph].

xxxi. 32. *DOMINATUS SUM Hier: *neglexi* (*-cl-*) Cypr [test (1 11) 3 20] Lact [div inst 4 20] Aug [Ps 118 33 de civ Dei 17 3 2 de spir et litt 33] Prosp Aqu [de voc om gent 9].

xxxi. 33. *DABO Hier id [adv iov 2 27] Aug [Ps 45 3, 118 33 de civ Dei ib de spir et litt ib] Prosp Aqu [ib] Leo Mag [ser 95 1] Fulg Rusp [ep 17 49]: *dans* Cypr [ib] Hier [Is 51 8, 54 12] Aug [quaest in hept 5 11 ser 155 6] Opt Mil [7 1 (de sch don 7)]: *dando* Aug [ser 212 2]: *scribam* Chromat Aqu [Mat 3 1].

xxxi. 37. *MENSURARI POTUERINT Hier: *exaltatum fuerit* Cypr [test 3 20].

xxxii. 17. *HEU heu heu Hier, who adds *sive qui es*: *quis es?* Ambr [apol davalt 62].

*EXTENTO Hier, who adds *sive excelso*: *excelso* Vigil Taps [c varim 1 11].

xxxii. 41. **et* LAETABOR Hier, who adds *sive et visitabo*: *et visitabo* Aug [con duas ep pel 4 14] Prosp Aqu [de voc om gent 1 9] (Leo Mag [ep ad demetr 15]).

N.B. St Jerome's Comm. is lacking after xxxii. 44.

xxxiii. 25. *SI PACTUM MEUM INTER DIEM ET NOCTEM ET LEGES COELO ET TERRAE NON POSUI: *si non esset testamentum meum in custodia die ac nocte, praecepta coeli et terrae non dedissem* Cassiod [Ps 32 11].

xxxv. 7. *NON PLANTABITIS Joh Cass [coll (xxi) de rem quin 4].

xxxv. 15. *CONSURGENS DILUCULO: om Ir [c haer 4 36 5].

xxxv. 16. *QUOD PRAECEPERAT EIS : om W.

xxxv. 17. **Dominus* EXERCITUUM, DEUS ISRAEL : *Dom*. W.

xxxv. 18. **obed*ISTIS : *audierunt filii Nadab filii Rachab* W.

*ET CUSTODISTIS OMNIA MANDATA EIUS : om W.

xxxv. 19. *HAEC DICIT DOMINUS EXERCITUUM DEUS ISRAHEL Joh Cass coll (xxi) de rem quin 4 : om W.

**de stirpe Ionadab* (*-bab* W) W : Joh Cass ib.

**cunctis diebus* (OM *terrae*) Joh Cass ib : *omnibus d. terrae* W.

xxxvi. 2. *ISRAEL : *Hierusalem* W.

*IOSIAE : *I. regis Iuda* W.

xxxvi. 6. *INGREDERE ERGO TU : om W.

*DE VOLUMINE...DOMINI : *carthas istas* W.

xxxvi. 9. *ET UNIVERSAE MULTITUDINI...IN IER. : *et in domo Iuda* W.

xxxvi. 31. *INIQUITATES SUAS : om W; Ir c haer 3 21 9.

**super* EOS W ; Ir ib.

*VIROS *Iuda* : domum *I.* W : *terram I.* Ir ib.

xxxvi. 32. *IEREMIAS AUTEM...SCRIBAE : *et accepit Baruch chartam aliam* W.

xxxvii. 1. *REX : om W.

*(*pro*) IECHONIA FILIO *Ioiachim* : (*pro*) *Ioachim* W.

xxxvii. 4. *(*in medio*) POPULI : (*per mediam*) TURBAM W.

*QUI OBSIDEBANT IERUSALEM : om W.

xxxvii. 5. *AB : *ad* W.

xxxvii. 8. **haec dicit Dominus* DEUS ISRAEL ; *sic dic*ETIS *regi Iuda qui misit* VOS : *sic d. Dms Des* (*sic*) *ad regem Iuda* quum miserunt *ad te* W.

xxxvii. 8. **nolite* DECIPERE ANIMAS VESTRAS: *n. praesumere animis vestris* W.

xxxvii. 17. *(*putasne, est*) *sermo* (*a Domino*)?: (ubi est) *verbum* (*Domini*? veniat) Ambr ep 85 3.

xxxviii. 23. **combur*ET IGNI: *comburetur* W.

xxxviii. 25. *QUID LOCUTUS SIS CUM REGE: *quid locutus est rex* W.

xxxviii. 27. *NIHIL ENIM FUERAT AUDITUM: *quia non est auditum verbum Domini* W.

xxxviii. 28. *ET FACTUM EST...IERUSALEM: om W, which also omits xxxix. 1, 2, 4—10, 11—13.

xxxix. 14. *UT INTRARET IN DOMUM: *et eiecerunt eum* in Iafreth W.

xxxix. 16. *ET ERUNT IN CONSPECTU TUO IN DIE ILLA: om W.

xl. 1. *DE IERUSALEM ET: om W.

xl. 3. *ET ADDUXIT: om W.

*ET FACTUS EST VOBIS SERMO HIC: om W.

xl. 4. *HODIE: om W.

*VENI *et ponam* W.

xl. 4, 5. *SI AUTEM...SED HABITA: et si malum est oculis tuis venire te mecum in Babyloniam, *revertere* W.

xli. 1. *ET OPTIMATES REGIS: om W.

xli. 2. *FILIUM AHICAM...EUM: om W.

xli. 3. *CUM GODOLIAM (*sic.* אִתּוֹ אֶת־גְ'): *cum eo* W.

*ET VIROS...ISMAHEL: om W.

xli. 5. **et de* SELO: *a Salem* W.

xli. 5, 6. W is confused. *in domum Domini, Et exie*runt *in obviam eis et euntes flebant et dicebant, introite etc.*

xli. 7. *IPSE ET VIRI QUI ERANT CUM EO: om W.

xli. 8. *INTER EOS: *ibi* W.

xli. 9. *OMNIA CADAVERA VIRORUM: *omnes* W.

*PROPTER GODOLIAM, (IPSE EST): magnus *est* W.

xli. 10. *ET CAPTIVAS DUXIT: *et revocavit* W.

*ET UNIVERSUM POPULUM, QUI REMANSERAT IN MASPHATH: om W.

**et abiit* UT TRANSIRET *ad filios Ammon*: *et abiit trans Ammon* W.

xli. 12. *VIRIS: *exercitum eorum* W.

xli. 13. *LAETATI SUNT: om W.

xli. 14. *ET REVERSUS EST...IN MASPHATH: om W.

*(*reversusque*) ABIIT *ad* (*Iohanan*) FILIUM CAREE: (*reversi sunt*) *ad Ionan* W.

xli. 15. *A FACIE IOHANAN: om W.

xli. 16. *FILIO NATHANIAE...FILIUM AHICAM: om W.

**fortes*: *potentes* W.

**et* PUEROS: *et reliqua* W.

xli. 17. *(*peregrinantes*) *in* CHAMAAM: *in* Chabercila W.

xlii. 2. *PRO NOBIS Hier [Is 30 1].

xlii. 10. **si quiescentes manseritis* Hier [ib].

xliii. 2. *TU LOQUERIS Hier [ib].

*DEUS NOSTER Hier [ib].

xliii. 10. *SERVUM MEUM Hier [ib].

**et ponet*: *et pon*AM Hier [ib].

**abscon*DI Hier [ib].

*SOLIUM SUUM Hier [ib].

xliii. 12. **et succendet* Hier [ib].

*ET AMICIETUR...AMICITUR Hier [ib].

xliv. 21. *HORUM (*recordatus est*...?) Salv [de gub Dei 6 45].

xliv. 22. *POTERAT Salv [ib].

*EO QUOD NON SIT HABITATOR: om Salv [ib].

xlvi. 8. *AEGYPTUS: *aqua Aegypti* Ps Aug [spec 106].

xlvi. 20. *STIMULATOR Hier[Is 19 2 Bened pag 202 Na 3 8].

**veniet ei* Hier[ib].

xlvii. 3. **a strepitu* pompae armorum, *et bellatorum eius*: *a voce impetus eius*, *ab* armis et *a pedibus eius* Ps Aug[spec 130].

xlvii. 6. *O: om Hier[Zach 5 1].

xlviii. 2. *(*non est ultra*) EXULTATIO *in Moab* Hier[Is 15 1 Bened pag 184].

xlviii. 7. **in munitionibus tuis* ET IN THESAURIS TUIS (a double rendering. See crit. note) Hier[Is ib]: *in mun. t.* id[Ezek 25 8].

xlviii. 11. **requievit* Eucher[lit form spir int 8].

**in* FAECIBUS *suis* Eucher[ib].

xlviii. 16. *INTERITUS: *dies* Hier[Ezek 25 8].

xlviii. 25. **abscisum est cornu Moab*, *et brachium eius contritum est*: quomodo *fracta est* virga fortis, baculus gloriosus Hier[Is 15 1 Bened pag 184].

xlviii. 26. **in* VOMITU *suo* Hier[ib].

xlviii. 27. **in derisum* Hier[ib].

*reperisses eum Hier[ib].

xlviii. 29. **superbus est valde* (ὕβρισεν, גָּאֶה) Hier[ib].

xlviii. 31. **eiul*ABO: *clam*ABO Hier[Is 16 7 Bened pag 190].

*ET AD MOAB Hier[ib].

**ad viros* muri *fictilis* Hier[ib].

*LAMENTANTES Hier[ib].

xlviii. 32. *DE *planctu*: *sicut fletum* Ambr[de el et ieiun 61].

*AD MARE *Iazer*: *civitas I.* Ambr[ib].

xlviii. 33. *SUSTULI: nequaquam calcator uvae solitum celeuma cantabit; *mane non calcaverunt*, meridie *autem non fecerunt* (om αἶδε) Ambr[ib].[1]

[1] The note in Migne points out that the Roman ed. for *meridie etc.* has *neque vespere fec. cel.*

xlviii. 37. *OM ἐν π. τ. Hier [Is 15 2 Bened pag 185]: *hab* id [Ezek 7 18].

xlix. 7. *NUMQUID NON *est*...? Hier [Abd 1].

xlix. 9. **rapuissent* QUOD SUFFICERET SIBI Hier [Abd 4].

xlix. 10. *DISCOPERUI (κατέσυρα): DISCOOP. Hier [ib].

**celari*: *celare* (al. *-ri*) Hier [ib].

xlix. 12. **et tu quasi innocens* RELINQUERIS? *non eris inn.*: *et tu* dum mandata videberis *non mundaberis* Sang.

*SED BIBENS BIBES: om Sang.

xlix. 13. *ET IN DESERTUM: om Sang.

*BOSRA: in parte tua Sang.

**civitates eius*: c. tuae Sang.

xlix. 16. *ARROGANTIA Hier [Abd 2]: *lusus tuus* Sang.

*DECEPIT Hier [ib]: *adquisivit* (*hoc tibi*) Sang.

*QUI HABITAS Hier [ib]: *habitavit* Sang.

*ALTITUDINEM *collis* Hier [ib]: *munitionem c. excelsi* Sang.

xlix. 17. *STUPEBIT ET *sibilabit super omnes plag*AS *eius*: *sibilabit* Sang.

xlix. 18. *DOMINUS: *Dom. omnipotens* Sang.

xlix. 19. *DE SUPERBIA Hier [Abd 7].

**ad* PULCHRITUDINEM Hier [ib].

*(*subito*) *currere* EUM *faciam* Hier [ib].

xlix. 22. *ASCENDET ET Hier [ib].

*EVOLABIT: VOLABIT Hier [ib].

*BOSRAM Hier [ib].

xlix. 24. *ANGUSTIA...PARTURIENTEM Hier [Is 17 1 Bened pag 193].

xlix. 27. *MOENIA Hier [ib].

*BENADAD: BENADAb Hier [ib].

xlix. 28. *ET AD REGNA ASOR Hier [Is 21 13 B. p. 218].

**et* VASTATE Hier [ib].

xlix. 31. **non* VECTES Hier [ib].

xlix. 32. **qui sunt* ATTONSI *in comam* Hier [ib].

xlix. 33. *ASOR Hier [ib].

xlix. 35. *ECCE EGO CONFRINGAM: *confringantur* Tycon [reg 4 (p 49)].

xlix. 37. *MALUM: om Tycon [ib].

l. 17. *EXOSSAVIT EUM: CONFRINGET OSSA ILLIUS Hier [Is 56 8]: (*comedit...*) *ossa eius* Ps Aug [spec 114].

l. 39. **struthiones* (θυγ. σειρ.): *filiae sirenum* Ambr [de fide 3 4].

li. 7. **inebrians omnem terram* Hier [Ion 3 6 tr hom or 2 2/2 (765, 766)]: *inebr. omnes* gentes id [Am 5 25].

**om* גּוֹיִם 2° Ambr [de el et ieiun 56]: *propter hoc* (*propterea*) *commotae sunt gentes* Hier [tr hom or 2 (765)], but om *gentes* [(766 et 767)] [(*a quo inebriatae sunt*) *gentes* Ambr [Ps 118 ד 41]].

li. 8. **resinam* Ambr [de ios pat 17] Hier [tr hom or 2 (768)] Joh Cass [coll (vii) de an mob 31 4].

li. 9. *(*non*) *est sanata* Hier [Ezek 47 6]: (*non*) *est curata* id [Eccles 7]: *s.* (*n.*) *e.* Ambr [ib].

li. 11. **re*GUM Hier [Is 21 1].

*MENS *eius* Hier [ib].

*TEMPLI *sui* Hier [ib].

li. 12. *CUSTODIAM Hier [ib].

*INSIDIAS Hier [ib].

li. 16. **dante eo vocem, multiplicantur aquae in coelo*: *et multitudinem aquarum in c.* Cypr [test 3 59]: *et posuit sonum aquae in c.* Vigil Taps [c varim 1 11]: *in voce posuit sonum aquarum in c.* Ps Aug [spec 132].

li. 25. *(*mons*) PESTIFER: *m. corrupte* Ambr [Luc lib 8 § 29 de fide 3 118].

li. 27. **regibus* ARARAT Hier [Is 21 1 Bened pag 213].

*MENNI Hier [ib].

*THAPSAR: TAPSAR Hier [ib].

**quasi bruch*UM ACULEATUM Hier[ib].

li. 28. *SANCTIFICATE Hier[Is ib Dan 5 30].

**reg*ES Hier[ib].

*OM κ. π. τ. γῆς Hier[ib].

*CUNCTAMQUE...EIUS Hier[Is ib]: so with *illius* for *eius* id[Dan ib].

li. 33. *FILIA *Babylon*IS Hier[Dan ib].

li. 37. *IN TUMULOS: IN TUM. arenarum Hier[Is 21 1 Bened pag 212].

li. 38. *RUGIENT, *excutient comas*: *exsurrexerunt* Ps Aug[spec 114].

li. 39. *(*ut*) *sopiantur*: *ut soporentur* Ps Aug[spec ib].

---

We may add a few general remarks upon the character of citations from the Latin in the fifth century, as found in John Cassian and Leo Magnus. In the case of the former there is little or no trace of Old Latin influence. A good illustration of the fact that his quotations were from the Vulg. is the following: i. 18, 19

| Vulg. | Joh Cass. Coll xviii 13. | Joh Cass. Ib xxiv 25. |
|---|---|---|
| Ego quippe dedi te | Ecce enim . . . | Ecce enim dedi te |
| hodie in civitatem | . . . . . . . . . | in columnam ferream |
| munitam et in colum- | . . . . . . . . . | et in murum aereum. |
| nam ferream, et in | . . . . . . . . . | . . . . . . . . . |
| murum aereum, super | . . . . . . . . . | . . . . . . . . . |
| omnem terram, regi- | . . . . . . . . . | . . . . . . . . . |
| bus Iuda, principibus | et pr. . . . . . | et principibus, et sa- |
| eius, et sacerdotibus, | dotibus eius, et . . | cerdotibus eius, et . |
| et populo terrae. Et | . . . . . . . . . | . . . . . . . . . |
| bellabunt adversum | . . . . . . . . . | . . . . . . . . . |
| te, et non praevale- | . . . . . . . . . | . . . . . . . . . |
| bunt; quia ego tecum | . . . . . . . . . | . . . . . . . . . |
| sum, ait Dominus, ut | . . . . . . . . ut | sum, ut eruam te, ait |
| liberem te. | eruam te. | Dominus. |

We further see from the above that he was willing to trust in some degree to his memory.

So in v. 3 ('percussisti...reverti') Joh Cass col (vi) de nece san 11 is virtually identical with the Vulgate.

In the case of Leo Magnus on the other hand there are plain traces of O. L. influence. The passage last referred to (v. 3) supplies an interesting example.

| Vulg. | Cypr ep ad Dem 7. | Leo Mag ser 84 (al 81) 1. |
|---|---|---|
| Percussisti eos et non doluerunt; attrivisti eos et renuerunt accipere disciplinam. | Verberasti eos, nec doluerunt; flagellasti eos, nec voluerunt accipere disciplinam. | Flagellasti eos et non dol.; castigasti eos et nol. accip. disc. |

Here Leo was evidently following (from memory) the O. L.

In his citation of Joel ii. 12, 13, there is an indication of a *mixture* of texts. The omission of *in* before *fletu* and *planctu*—so at least Cypr de lap 29 ep 55 22 (comp. ad Novat 9) and others—suggesting the O. L., while the same is more clearly indicated in *v.* 15 by *praedicate curationem* (so Hier cites more than once, and for *cur.* see Cypr test 2 19 while Vulg. has *vocate coetum*). At the same time the latter part of *v.* 12 presents an inaccurate recollection of both versions.

If we might assume the genuineness of Leo's *Epistola ad Demetriadem*, we should find other examples of the influence of O. L. in his case.

(*a*) Ep ad Demetr 4 (Ps xciii. 11) 'sapientium' (but Amiat has *hominum*) with Tert c marc 5 6 and Cypr *de bono patient.* 2.

(*b*) Ib 4 (Ps ix. 23 [x. 3]) 'et qui iniqua gerit' (so

St Augustine and Cassiodorus in their Commentaries *ad loc*). Vulg. has *et iniquus*. On the other hand, in the immediate neighbourhood of these (ib 5) we have him (Job ii. 3) in substantial agreement with the Vulg., while the O. L. (MS. Maj Monast) there has 'Animadvertisti ergo famulum meum Job, quia non est quisquam similis illi super terram, homo innocens, verax, Dei cultor, abstinens se ab omni malo.' The citation of Job i. 3, which immediately succeeds, is as obviously taken from the Vulg., while that of ii. 7 clearly shews acquaintance with both versions. A summarizing of xlii. 10, 13 follows, and cannot be reckoned to either side. Then comes vii. 1, a conspicuous case of indebtedness to O. L.

---

From the above examination of evidence supplied from O. L. sources we may deduce the following general results.

1. The O. L., as we should naturally expect from its origin, gives in general its support to the Septuagint, where that Version differs from the Massoretic Text.

2. Where O. L. evidence favours the M.T. against the Septuagint as represented by B, there is generally a fair amount of other strong evidence, whether of Greek MSS. or of Versions, in support of the former. E.g. xvi. 18, xvii. 20, xix. 8, xxii. 7, 13, xxiii. 10 (*bis*), 14, 29, xxxvii. 4. On such occasions W is supported by AQ rather than ℵ. In xl. 4 however (*veni*, בּוֹא, ἥκε; see crit. note) we have a case of support from ℵ.

3. Now and then however we find O. L. supporting M.T. against B (or an otherwise strongly supported Septuagint reading), without any such collateral evi-

dence on the side of the former. Instances are xviii. 21, xxiii. 31[1].

4. Very rarely do we find a tolerable amount of O. L. evidence in support of any of the best Greek uncials for a reading which is opposed both to M.T. and to B. In xxxi. 33 the omission of δώσω (with AQ) is a case in point, supported by Cypr Aug and Opt Mil (as well as by Hier twice).

In respect of the character of O. L. *manuscript* evidence we may note the following points:

(i) As regards W.

(*a*) It sometimes supports B against obviously right readings of other principal uncials (e.g. xxxvii. 1, 5).

(*b*) Its support of Ambrose suggests an Italian type of text (e.g. xxii. 28 *bis*; comp. 29).

(*c*) It is clearly non-African. Obs. in xxiii. 17 how a Greek (Bℵ AQ) conflation, adopted by W, is rejected by Cypr, and comp. W's support of O′ in xxiii. 28 [29].

(ii) As regards Sang.

It is too scanty to speak with much confidence as to details. It is however obviously a form of O. L. text, but in one passage at any rate (*de*[*sideravi*] xvii. 16) it seems influenced by the Vulg. and in three cases (xvii. 13, xlix. 13 *bis*) gives us a unique reading.

## Lucianic MSS.

In chapters i—v. the Lucianic evidence differs from B as follows:

[1] We may observe how in xxiii. 6 (καὶ Ἰερ.) O. L. supports M.T. and BAQ against ℵ, although this last probably preserves the true text.

(i) It agrees with M.T. *in supplying omissions.*

In such cases it is

(*a*) supported by one or more principal Greek MSS.

i. 4 (AQ), 11 (אAQ), 17 (אAQ); ii. 6 (אQ), 9 (AQ), 28 (אAQ); iii. 10 (Q supports 'את); iv. 7 *ter* (Q), 8 (Q), 10 (AQ), 20 ('אה is partially supported by A); v. 1 (Q), 19 (Q) = 15 cases.

(*b*) Not so supported.

i. 3, 11, 13, 18 *bis*; ii. 1, 2, 19; iii. 7, 8, 10 ('נ' י), 11, 16, 17; iv. 12 ('מא), 30; v. 4 ('אל), 14, 28 *bis* (but see crit. note) = 20 cases.

(ii) It agrees with M.T. *otherwise.*

(*a*) Supported etc.

i. 2 (0 + 1; Q), 4 (1 + 1; AQ); iii. 6 (A* vid), 9 (א), 22 (Q); iv. 10 ('ונ א*AQ), 12 (λαλήσω Q), 14 (AQ), 30 (0 + 3; אAQ); v. 1 (Q) = 10 cases.

(*b*) Not so supported.

i. 9 (0 + 1); ii. 6, (25); iii. 3 (0 + 1), 19; iv. 4 = 6 cases.

(iii) It differs from both M.T. and B.

(*a*) Supported by O. L. evidence.

ii. 3, 6 (υἱ. ἀνθ. but in this case אQ agree with Luc.), 8 (but here אAQ have μοῦ) = 3 cases.

(*b*) Not so supported.

i. 15, 16; iii. 2; v. 6, (7), 11 (but in this last Luc receives *some* support from B); v. 24 = 8 cases.

N.B. In i. 10 Luc 4 + 2 (+ 1) agree with B against M.T. in omitting ἐπί 2°.

In iv. 29 Luc 4 + 2 agree with B against M.T. in reading πᾶσα χώρα.

In v. 17 Luc 1 (+ 1) agree with B against M.T. in reading κ. τοὺς ἐλαι. ὑμῶν.

The summary of cases given above shews

(*a*) that a large proportion of the total number of Lucianic variants consists in the assimilation of the Greek to the Heb. text by the supply of "omissions":

(*b*) that of these variants again a large proportion (in these chapters it is as 4 to 3) are without support from any principal Greek uncial:

(*c*) that many Lucianic variants of other kinds receive support from one or more principal Greek uncials.

(*d*) that in a few cases Lucianic readings, differing from M.T. and B, receive O. L. support. There is however but one case in these five chapters (ii. 3) where such a reading is without support from at least one principal Greek uncial.

This last point, viz. a connexion between O. L. and Lucianic readings, seemed to justify an examination of the remainder of the Book with this special subject in view. The result of such an examination gives Luc MSS. supporting O. L. evidence in

x. 25. Luc 4 + 3 *βασιλείας* (but so too Q).

xvii. 13. Luc 3 ( + 1) + 2 *ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς* (so ℵ[c.a]).

xxi. 9. Luc 3( + 1) + 2 *εἰς ὠφέλειαν*.

xxxix. [xlvi.] 14. Luc 2 + 0 *εἰς Ἰαφίθ*.

xl. [xlvii.] 4, 5. Luc 4 + 1 have additions like those of W.

xlviii. [xxxi.] 31. Luc 3 + 1 have *τείχους κειράδας* (-*δος*).

It will be seen therefore that in the last four cases we have Luc and O. L. readings unsupported by any principal Greek uncial.

## LIST OF LATIN AUTHORITIES USED IN THE APPENDIX.

*** *The numbers following the names of writers indicate, unless fl. be prefixed, the year of death. Parentheses enclosing numbers denote uncertainty. Where no edition is specified, Migne has been used.*

Altercatio Simonis et Theophili

Ambrosius 397; de Off and Hex are taken from Gilbert, Leipzig, 1839

Anonymi Tractatus adv. Novatianum

Arnobius Afer (313)

Auctor lib de voc gent

Auctor quaestionum ex utroque Testamento

Augustinus 430

(Ps) Augustinus *Speculum*[1]

Bachiarius Monachus fl 401

Breviarium Fidei adv. Arianos *post* 300

Cassianus (Johannes) (443); Petschenig, Vienna, 1886—88

Cassiodorus (575)

Chromatius Aquileiensis (407)

Commodianus (250); Dombart, Vienna, 1887

[1] Liber de Div. Script. sive Speculum quod fertur S. Augustini, the second of the two edited by Weihrich, Vienna, 1887, and "generally considered to contain a degenerate African text" (Burkitt, *Tyconius* p. lxi, quoting Sanday's opinion in *Stud. Bibl.* i. 249 and S. Berger, *Vulgate*, p. 6).

Cyprianus 258; Hartel, Vienna, 1868
Dionysius Exiguus 550
Epistolae Decretales S. Stephano adscriptae
Eucherius 450
Eugippius (520); Knoell, Vienna, 1885, 1886
Facundus Episcopus Hermeianensis (571)
Faustinus Presbyter (400)
Faustinus et Marcellinus (400)
Faustus Rhegiensis c. 492
Ferreolus Uceticensis 581
(Julius) Firmicus Maternus (360); Halm, Vienna, 1867
Foegadius (or Phoebadius) c. 392
Fulgentius Ferrandus c. 549
Fulgentius Ruspensis 533
Gaudentius Brixiensis fl. 405
Hieronymus 420
Hilarius 368; the Psalms are taken from Zingerle, Vienna, 1886
Irenaeus 202; Stieren, Leipzig, 1848
Justus Urgellensis (550)
Lactantius (325); Brandt, Prague, Vienna, Leipzig, 1890
Leo Magnus 461
Lucifer Calaritanus 371; Hartel, Vienna, 1886
Marius Mercator (452)
Novatianus c. 255
Optatus Milevitanus fl. 411; Ziwsa, Prague, Vienna, Leipzig, 1893
Orosius fl. 415
Pacianus *ante* 392
Paschasius diaconus c. 512
Paulinus Nolanus 431; Hartel, Vienna, 1894
Petrus Chrysologus 454
Philastrius (387); Oehler, Berlin, 1856
Praedestinatus (460)
Primasius Adrumatanus c. 554
Priscillianus 385; Schepss, Würzburg, 1886

Prosper Aquitanus (465)
Rufinus Aquileiensis 410
Rusticus diaconus fl. 550
Salvianus fl. 429; Pauly, Vienna, 1883
Siricius 398
(Ps) Sulpicius Severus; Halm, Vienna, 1866
(Maximus) Taurinensis (470)
Tertullianus c. 240; Reiffersheid and Wissowa, Vienna, 1886; but his books against Marcion are taken from Oehler, Leipzig, 1854
Tyconius *ante* 383; Burkitt, Cambridge, 1895
Victor Capuanus 554
(Marius) Victorinus Afer fl. 360
Victor Vitensis c. 490; Petschenig, Vienna, 1881
Victorinus Pettavensis c. 290
Vigilius Tapsensis fl. 484
Zacchaeus Christianus fl. 420
Zeno Veronensis c. 380

# INDEX.

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY J. & C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.